

N. EDD MILLER: PRESIDENTIAL MEMOIR, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO, 1965-1973

Interviewee: N. Edd Miller

Interviewed: 1972-1973

Published: 1989

Interviewer: Mary Ellen Glass

UNOHP Catalog #064

Description

N. Edd Miller served as chancellor and then president of the University of Nevada, Reno, from 1965 to 1973, a crucial and exciting period. During his tenure, the university underwent important changes in administrative structure, launched a building program that altered the face of the campus, and suffered many of the pangs of student and racial unrest that afflicted higher education nationwide at that time. Yet, the students at Reno also honored their president in a rare display of esteem and affection on "N. Edd Miller Day." Dr. Miller's account of his years as president is thus vital for understanding a watershed era.

N. Edd Miller's Presidential Memoir is the first volume in a series of memoirs of former presidents of the University of Nevada, Reno.

**N. EDD MILLER: PRESIDENTIAL MEMOIR,
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO, 1965-1973**

**N. EDD MILLER: PRESIDENTIAL MEMOIR,
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO, 1965-1973**

An Oral History Conducted by Mary Ellen Glass

University of Nevada Oral History Program

Copyright 1989
University of Nevada Oral History Program
Mail Stop 0324
Reno, Nevada 89557
unohp@unr.edu
<http://www.unr.edu/oralhistory>

All rights reserved. Published 1989.
Printed in the United States of America

Publication Staff:
Director: R.T. King

University of Nevada Oral History Program Use Policy

All UNOHP interviews are copyrighted materials. They may be downloaded and/or printed for personal reference and educational use, but not republished or sold. Under “fair use” standards, excerpts of up to 1000 words may be quoted for publication without UNOHP permission as long as the use is non-commercial and materials are properly cited. The citation should include the title of the work, the name of the person or people interviewed, the date of publication or production, and the fact that the work was published or produced by the University of Nevada Oral History Program (and collaborating institutions, when applicable). Requests for permission to quote for other publication, or to use any photos found within the transcripts, should be addressed to the UNOHP, Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV 89557-0324. Original recordings of most UNOHP interviews are available for research purposes upon request.

CONTENTS

Preface to the Digital Edition	ix
Introduction	xi
1. Introduction	1
2. Organization and Operation of the President's Office	11
3. Relationships with the Board of Regents	67
4. Schools and Colleges	83
5. Intercollegiate Athletics	103
6. Special Problems of Campus Minorities	113
7. ROTC	121
8. Student Life and Student Government	129
9. Public Relations and Development	155
10. Legislative Lobbying and Inter-Agency Relations	165
11. Campus-Related Organizations	175

12. Documents of Governance	179
13. Other Activities	189
14. My Last Year at Nevada	195
15. Conclusion	205
Original Index: For Reference Only	211

PREFACE TO THE DIGITAL EDITION

Established in 1964, the University of Nevada Oral History Program (UNOHP) explores the remembered past through rigorous oral history interviewing, creating a record for present and future researchers. The program's collection of primary source oral histories is an important body of information about significant events, people, places, and activities in twentieth and twenty-first century Nevada and the West.

The UNOHP wishes to make the information in its oral histories accessible to a broad range of patrons. To achieve this goal, its transcripts must speak with an intelligible voice. However, no type font contains symbols for physical gestures and vocal modulations which are integral parts of verbal communication. When human speech is represented in print, stripped of these signals, the result can be a morass of seemingly tangled syntax and incomplete sentences—totally verbatim transcripts sometimes verge on incoherence. Therefore, this transcript has been lightly edited.

While taking great pains not to alter meaning in any way, the editor may have removed false starts, redundancies, and the “uhs,” “ahs,” and other noises with which speech is often liberally sprinkled; compressed some passages which, in unaltered form, misrepresent the chronicler's meaning; and relocated some material to place information in its intended context. Laughter is represented with [laughter] at the end of a sentence in which it occurs, and ellipses are used to indicate that a statement has been interrupted or is incomplete...or that there is a pause for dramatic effect.

As with all of our oral histories, while we can vouch for the authenticity of the interviews in the UNOHP collection, we advise readers to keep in mind that these are remembered pasts, and we do not claim that the recollections are entirely free of error. We can state, however, that the transcripts accurately reflect the oral history recordings on which they were based. Accordingly, each transcript should be approached with the

same prudence that the intelligent reader exercises when consulting government records, newspaper accounts, diaries, and other sources of historical information. All statements made here constitute the remembrance or opinions of the individuals who were interviewed, and not the opinions of the UNOHP.

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, most have been reformatted, a process that was completed in 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

For more information on the UNOHP or any of its publications, please contact the University of Nevada Oral History Program at Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, 89557-0324 or by calling 775/784-6932.

Alicia Barber
Director, UNOHP
July 2012

INTRODUCTION

N. Edd Miller served as President of the University of Nevada, Reno, through a crucial and exciting period. During his tenure, the University underwent important changes in administrative structure, launched a building program that altered the face of the campus, and suffered many of the pangs of student and racial unrest that afflicted higher education. Yet, the students at Reno also honored their President in a rare display of esteem and affection on "N. Edd Miller Day." Dr. Miller's account of his years as President is thus vital for understanding of a watershed era.

President Miller, invited to tape record his recollections as a "Presidential memoir" for the Oral History Project, accepted graciously. There were twenty-one taping sessions, all held in the President's office on the Reno campus between September, 1972 and October, 1973. Dr. Miller was a relaxed and candid memoirist, answering questions and recounting events with apparent pleasure. Dr. Miller's review of the transcript of these recordings resulted in no significant changes in language or content. The Oral History

Project of the University of Nevada, Reno, Library preserves the past and the present for future research by tape recording the recollections of persons who have been important to the region's development. N. Edd Miller's *Presidential Memoir* is the first of a planned series with past (and future) University Presidents. Dr. Miller has generously donated his literary rights in the *Memoir* to the University of Nevada, and has restricted research access until January, 1989. Copies of N. Edd Miller's *Presidential Memoir* have been deposited with the Oral History Project office and the University of Nevada Archives, restricted as designated above.

Mary Ellen Glass
University of Nevada, Reno
January, 1975

INTRODUCTION

I am a native of Houston, Texas. I went to the University of Texas in Austin, in 1936, graduated in 1939, and a Master's degree in 1940, and then taught at the University of Texas from 1940 until 1947. And in the summers during that time, I went to the University of Michigan and summer school and so I went in '47 to finish my degree, and stayed at the University of Michigan from '47 to 1965.

At the University of Michigan, I went there, first year, as a lecturer in speech and then as an instructor and then moved up through the ranks and for about two years was involved in addition of teaching with a major research project in the psychology department on conference methods. About 1951 or '52, I became involved as an assistant director of summer session and worked in the summer session until about 1960 or '61 part-time. Then the last two or three years I was there, I worked in the office of vice president for academic affairs. I, all this time, was doing some teaching too. I think that's enough background.

In the late summer of 1964, I guess, a letter came to the president's office at the University of Michigan about the reorganization of the two campuses of the University of Nevada, the Nevada Southern University [then] and the University of Nevada in Reno seeking in a very usual kind of way, seeking nominations from the president for these two jobs. And the president sent my name in. I heard nothing for a while and then sometime in September or October, I had a letter from Jerry Crawford at Nevada Southern University, who was chairman of the selection committee in Las Vegas, inviting me to come out for an interview at Las Vegas and also while I was there, I would be scheduled to come to Reno. And then subsequently I had a letter from Maurice Beesley who was chairman of the selection committee on this campus, extending the invitation in conjunction with the visit to Las Vegas.

I'd never been to Nevada before in my life and I was happy with my job, making almost as much money as this job paid at the time and well settled in Ann Arbor. We'd bought

a new house—as these things always go—a couple of years [before] this. I was a member of the board of education in Ann Arbor, the county school board, very active in this kind of thing, and very active in the community, on the city planning board and a variety of other things, so we had no intention of moving. But I tell faculty members here who get job offers, they're fools not to look at it at least. And since they were interested enough to pay my way out, and it was the opportunity to visit a state I hadn't been in before, I came.

I spent two days in Las Vegas with Jerry Crawford. I'm sorry I don't remember all the committee members there. I was impressed with the vigor of that new campus—at that time I think there were three buildings on the campus. Jerry Crawford was and is a very young man, had just received his doctorate in speech and theater and had done his work with some people that I had known well over the years, so we struck up a nice relationship [which has continued, incidentally]. They had a reception for the faculty and I met the faculty (and there weren't very many in those days; I probably met them all). And Dr. Juanita White, a regent from Boulder City, came to that meeting and I visited with her for thirty or forty minutes.

They put me on the plane for Reno. I got in at night after, in those days, a two-hour trip on the Bonanza Air Line, and rode in on the plane with Irving Sandorf, who was flying back from Las Vegas. He had relatives in Ann Arbor and I believe had gone to the University of Michigan many years ago, and was very kind and told me a lot about the University today and about the branch at Las Vegas. We had a very nice two-hour visit on the way up. I was met the next morning early by Maurice Beesley. I stayed at the Mapes Hotel and he met me in his Volkswagen.

It happened to be October 31; that meant nothing to me except it was Hallowe'en. So we came to the campus and the campus was deserted. But President Armstrong had come in and he and Bonnie Smotony were up here in this office, and I spent about an hour with him. I met next with Dean [Ralph] Irwin, who was in this building at the time, and with Dean [Thomas] O'Brien, and about three hours—I believe two or three hours—maybe it just seemed that long—with a selection committee. Maurice Beesley was chairman and Dave Heron was on the committee, and Eleanor Bushnell and Ben Wofford. There may have been one other, I'm not—should've looked this up, but I didn't. We had, I thought, a very—at least I enjoyed the conversation, thought it went very well.

One thing that impressed me, this must've been a Saturday as well as the thirty-first, because the University was playing football here then, and coming from Ann Arbor in a year when the football team was headed toward the Rose Bowl and a lot of fever in Ann Arbor about football, I asked Charlie Armstrong who we were playing and he didn't know. And I asked the selection committee who Nevada was playing and nobody there knew. [Laughs] So I guess that was one of my early impressions, that athletics in this kind of perspective instead of the kind that Ann Arbor was going through at that time.

Everyone was very kind to me. Maurice drove me around the campus and uh—. But, as I say, there were no people here, my impressions were really restricted to the few people I visited with that day. But I guess my general impression, comparing the two, was that, the Las Vegas situation had many challenges, obviously dynamic, growing, resentful kind of campus, very resentful—even then—of this campus. The big problem I heard a lot about at the time was whether

the proposed two-year nursing program at Las Vegas should be administered by the Orvis School of Nursing up here or should it be an independent program down there. Their attitudes were very strong on this as you might imagine! This [Reno] seemed more like the two universities I've been to, and more my notion of what a university's about. Even with the very limited kind of contact, I came away feeling that I would have some interest in this job, perhaps, not very much in the Las Vegas job. And, as I say, I wasn't looking for a job, so this seemed more like a university position than the other.

I recall very well my first sight of Reno from the airplane and that was very impressive; and it still is, as a matter of fact, to come in at night and see the twinkling lights and the desert below. It was dark and it was very nice. Downtown Reno was something like I'd never seen before. Even Las Vegas didn't quite prepare me because at Las Vegas I stayed at the Thunderbird, and their campus is out, as you know, near the Strip. One day Jerry Crawford drove me down in the downtown area, just drove through and you know, I really wasn't downtown in Las Vegas, on the Strip instead. So this was an eye-opener.

I spent a couple of hours that evening wandering around the casinos and investing a couple of dollars in nickels in slot machines. I recall talking to Maurice Beesley—his comment either about himself or some member of his faculty who, as part of his consulting privilege, had served as consultant, I guess to a slot machine manufacturer, on probability and this sort of thing, which coming from Ann Arbor, Michigan struck me as a way that no faculty member at the University of Michigan would be asked to consult, but quite a legitimate way here.

Well, I went back to Ann Arbor having thoroughly enjoyed the experience and having

met some very nice people. The chairmen of the two selection committees were very fine indeed, nice people. Then I guess during the Christmas vacation period, I had follow-up letters from the two committees, but no word, really. I got a phone call from Charlie Armstrong, offering me the job here in Reno. Someone, a real estate person, I guess, sent me some clippings, too, about my appointment. And it became clear that I was about second or third on the list of second or third choices, I guess, among the list of ones that the Board of Regents had dealt with. So I'd been turned down a couple of times already I guess, before they got to my name, which was all right. At least this is what I'd judge from the newspaper stories.

Charlie Armstrong called at a time when everybody in the administration at the University of Michigan was at the Rose Bowl game, and I think I was probably in charge, [laughs] [for a] few days 'cause there were so few around. And I told him I needed to talk to Roger Heyns, with whom I was working, and I wanted to talk to Harlan Hatcher, who was the president, that I didn't feel I could give an answer without at least alerting them or discussing it with them. He seemed somewhat impatient about this, maybe because of the previous refusals, I don't know, or they wanted to get this tied up. After the people I wanted to talk to at Michigan came back, I did discuss it with them and then called Charlie and told him that I would take the job. So that's a kind of capsule version of how I got here.

I came back in the spring of '65 and spent a week here on campus, which was a very useful time. It was, ironically enough in light of later events, the week of Governor's Day, although in 1965 there were no problems at Governor's Day. As a matter of fact, at the end of that Governor's Day ceremony, there was a motorcade with police escort that went from

the stadium to the Mapes or to the Holiday Hotel downtown, all traffic stopped as the cars went by; it was a big thing. The visiting general from Sixth Army was honored guest at a luncheon that the President had for him. During the week I was here, it was really the first opportunity I'd had to meet with a lot of people, and talk to them and find out something more about the University.

I was taken in tow by Mike Ingersoll, who had just been elected student body president and who was extraordinarily kind to me that week. I recall I guess the first morning I was here, I was staying at the Union in one of the guest rooms and Mike came by and we took a walk around campus so he could show me buildings and introduce me to people. The first place he headed for was Jake Lawlor's office, and I think therefore Jake was one of the first people I met. Mike was very fond of Jake. We went over and spent thirty, forty minutes with Jake.

I spent some time with Jean Baldwin, who is the secretary in what had been the executive vice-president's office when Ken Young was here, and who was carrying on really the functions of that office with Ralph Irwin's help. He was kind of either— I'm not sure whether he was officially designated but he was performing as a kind of executive vice-president as well as the dean of the Arts and Science.

Jim Anderson spent some time with me about housing, drove me around, showed me some houses, took me to his house to see what it was like. Bill Adams was in those days, I guess, director of the Union, and also housing officer, mostly for students on campus, and he was very kind—spent a lot of time with me, showing me houses. One of the first places he took me was to see Bob Laxalt, so that was also one of the early people I met. We went to the Laxalt's house, visited with them.

One thing that impressed me was how quickly apparent it was that this is a small and very friendly state. Obviously Governor Sawyer was on campus for Governor's Day and I recall spending before the Governor's Day ceremony, oh, twenty or thirty minutes talking with him, and ending up on a first name basis. And from big and populous states like Texas and Michigan, that kind of thing doesn't happen quickly at least. And that impressed me that he was a very friendly person and very nice and very cordial in every way.

My impression after the week here was, I felt very good about accepting the job. It always prior to that had been with such small contact with the university that it was really a gamble about how it would turn out, but I felt—. I went home to Ann Arbor feeling very good about the situation here and the kind of people that I'd met and the kind of reception I'd received from them, which couldn't have been nicer. I was treated royally and that was a fine feeling.

Colonel [Robert L.] Gundlach, the ROTC commandant, had a party at his home the evening of Governor's Day, or the night before (I'm sorry, I can't remember which). A cocktail party for faculty and administrators mostly, but present was a young man who was the commandant or the colonel of the cadets, and I'm sorry I can't remember his name, but his date was one of the most beautiful young ladies I've ever seen. Her name was Michon Maupin, and somebody took a Polaroid picture of Michon and me with our arms around each other to send back to my wife. And I told her, of course, this was just a typical co-ed at the University of Nevada. Michon, incidentally, and her sister, Michele, and the whole Maupin family subsequently were very good friends in many ways.

During that spring, in addition to the visit out here, I recall when I met with the

selection committee, kind of complaining to them that before I came out for the interview on October 31, I tried to get in the library at Michigan some books or something that would tell me something about Nevada, about Reno, and about the University, and found almost nothing. The only thing I found that was very useful was the WPA Writer's Guide on Nevada, which was done about 1938 or '39, and in light of the way the state had grown, was hopelessly out of date. A lot of photographs, but they were 1930 photographs, and downtown Las Vegas, for example, looked like a set from "Gunsmoke" in those '30's pictures and that's not the way it was. Eleanor Bushnell sent me some material after I got back to Ann Arbor and Ben Wofford sent me some of the publications from the Bureau of Business Research, which helped some.

During that spring I was visited in Ann Arbor by [George] Burke Maxey, who in those days had some connection with one of the "Big Ten" schools, I believe Indiana University, and was back in the Midwest frequently, was in Ann Arbor and came by and spent an hour or so with me. And Roberta Barnes was on a leave of absence, doing a study (interestingly enough, about women), and on a scholarship of some sort and she was in Ann Arbor. We had inaugurated some programs involving women there, and so I had some responsibility for parts of these. She spent some time with me and that helped.

But the most useful contact I had was with Ken Young, who had been executive vice-president here. I had not known him but that time he was president of the State University of New York at—well, one of the State University of New York colleges. He and I were in attendance together at a spring meeting of the Association of Higher Education and somebody introduced us, a

mutual friend, and Ken very kindly spent a whole afternoon with me. We had lunch together and then until four or five o'clock, I think, as I recall, giving me a very good, very accurate picture of University of Nevada, Reno. It was a very useful briefing, really from someone who knew the institution well and who was in fact the author of the reorganization that led to the two chancellors on the two campuses.

While I was here, the day I was here, they did schedule luncheon with local regents, and I met at that time in the Union. Fred Anderson and Grant Davis and Louis Lombardi, and I guess Charlie Armstrong was the other one there; may have been one other regent, but I think that was the group. I was impressed with them; they're the kind of people that do make good impressions and that helped in my feeling about the University, too.

I think that's about all the preliminary, prior to my coming here in late June of 1965. I came out by train. I [am] very fond of trains and that seemed to be the best way to come. On the train I met Bill Hancock's wife, who had been back visiting family in Michigan, and her two little boys. Sitting in the dome car [I] got acquainted with the little boys and then with her and she told me that her husband was director of the State Planning Board. So we had a nice visit on the train. Also on the train was Mai Britt, the wife at that time of Sammy Davis, Jr., and she had her children with her too, and I struck up a conversation with one of her children and with her, and we visited some on the train. And when we got in the next morning, about five o'clock in the morning, to Reno, as we were waiting to get off the train, she said, "I have a car here to meet me; if I can take you to the campus, I'd be happy to do so." And I looked out and there were two Rolls Royces there. Bill Harrah'd sent a car for her, and another to take her baggage

and her maid up to the Lake where she was headed, and I was on the verge of saying yes when I saw Jim Hathorne, the assistant dean of men, come running down the platform—at five o'clock in the morning. And so I came to the campus instead in his 1940 Chevrolet, [laughs] or whatever it was. But after getting up at that hour in the morning, [laughs] I didn't have any choice, really.

This was about June 26, 27, thereabouts, you know. Nena was home in Ann Arbor trying to sell the house and taking care of all the packing and getting ready to move, and our daughter was a junior-to-be in that fall at Wellesley, and was in Ann Arbor with her roommate. Both of them had jobs in Ann Arbor. And our son was home. So she had her hands full. I originally planned to fly back and drive out with her, but she found some way to ship the car out, or have someone drive it out; then she came out by plane. She came out in August and by then—.

She came out twice during the summer before she moved out. I'd accumulate a list of houses and then she'd come out and we'd spend two or three days and we'd look at houses. And we found the house on Canyon Drive. We'd tried very hard to find one within five or six blocks of the campus, within easy walking distance, and there just was nothing available that was suitable in any fashion; primarily none that were big enough to entertain in, and we wanted a place where we could do this. And once you got away from easy walking distance, it seemed to us—find a house that you like—so we're about five miles from the campus, but the house has been a very happy one to live in.

The summer in those days was a noticeably calmer period of time than the winter. Things have changed in that regard, too. But it was a good time to be here, to get kind of broken in on what the campus was about. Again, I

met with enormously good reception from everyone and great kindness and great consideration by everyone. I spent most of the summer visiting around campus; every day had two or three appointments with deans, department chairmen, directors, heads of units of one sort or another. Most of them, by scheduling it right, I could find during the summer sometime. I went to their offices, both because I think that's the way it should be done, and also it was a way for me to get acquainted with the campus too, and spent in each case thirty minutes to an hour just finding out what they were doing, what their aspirations were for their unit, and getting acquainted with them personally and professionally. And this was a very useful thing to me in getting to know the campus piece by piece and then trying to put it together in some fashion. That was my problem. But getting to know it this way, and having the time to do it without the onrush of students in the fall or something of the sort was a very good time.

In general, in talking to department chairmen and deans, I think I concluded the campus was in reasonably good health. In a situation like that it's sometimes hard to tell at first, because I think there're some defenses that build up—or they're there right at the beginning—that if you go in and ask a department chairman how things are in his department and you're a stranger to him, his first reaction is a kind of "Fine!" So it takes, in some cases took, some probing to find out what the problems were and what the strengths were and what the hopes were for the future.

There still were [a] lot of scars of the problems that grew out of President Stout's administration, and I heard about these. I heard about them so much, but in such fragments, that it was a long time before I

really knew the whole sequence of events of the Stout thing. I would hear a portion or an event or something of the sort and it was actually a couple of years before I really got a logical sequence of what it was all about. But there still were a lot of scars, a lot more than now I think, even among people who're still here that—I think it's died.

It was very clear also that President Armstrong had done a great deal to salvage many of the things that I think are of value in a good university. Apparently, when he first came, one of the first things he did was to set about creating some kind of faculty input into governance of the University. I can't really overplay the importance of that. The University Council, I think, was the predecessor of the present Faculty Senate—had been created in his first year, I believe, or first two years, at the University. And I think faculty of all persuasions were satisfied that their voices were being heard now, and in meaningful ways. So while there were a lot of references back to the Stout problems, there was no indication that these were operative now that—the wounds were there, but the healing had taken place, I think quite well.

In general there was, I think, a good morale and optimism about the future. The University had entered on, several years prior to that, a long period of growth in enrollment. And state support had not been spectacular, but it had been steady, and about the average, as I discovered before I came here, for state support in terms of increase year by year across the country. It was neither in the top nor the bottom group. So there were, I think, good reasons for optimism.

There was even, then, though, some concern about what was going to happen in Las Vegas, and I think some distrust about the reorganization of the University, with the two chancellors, because it tended to give an

emphasis to the Las Vegas quote “branch” and quote that a lot of the faculty members, old time faculty members especially, felt was not justified. And there was considerable feeling then, and I still hear it from time to time, that the state is too small in population and in wealth to support two major universities. And so that kind of feeling was in existence, but it was not an overriding kind of feeling; it wasn't the kind of thing that permeated day-to-day living or the kinds of decisions that were made, maybe because while the reorganization had taken place, this campus still was in charge.

All new courses and programs had to be cleared through the Academic Council, the council of deans here, and that's true for a couple of years after I came. The only representative from Las Vegas who sat on that, along with the academic deans from this campus, was the chancellor of the campus down there and I was designated by President Armstrong as the chairman of the Academic Council.

So the control, even in the early years of reorganization, was substantially still here. On the academic side and on the business side. Neil Humphrey was vice president reporting directly to President Armstrong on the business affairs of the whole University System. So the chancellors really were, in the initial job descriptions, were primarily academic and student life officers and not financial officers. We had no responsibility for financial affairs—buildings and grounds, any of the business side. This was all in the vice president's hands.

Neil Humphrey's office was here on campus, so the control was pretty heavy in Reno, and I think therefore, while there was a lot of talk, and maybe some fear about what would happen eventually in the south, there also was a kind of complacency that we had things under control now at least.

A few things that—. It seemed to me the University—maybe there'd been so much emotional energy spent in the days of the Stout administration and in recovery from it in the early days of the Armstrong administration, that one kind of very important impression I had about program and curriculum was that this was kind of rocking along on its own, that there was not much planning in terms of program. Things were going on tomorrow as they had today, and I'm not a revolutionary and I had no intention of coming in with a new broom and sweeping everything, but I was a little bit concerned that the tradition and the academic side was kind of overpowering.

Among the first things I did in the fall, I set up, in addition to the Academic Council, some informal luncheon meetings with the academic deans on campus, and we went through the whole campus with each dean being given about two hours to present, both in writing and orally to his colleagues, a five-year plan and a ten-year plan about development and growth of his school or his college or his unit. And the reason for this was not just busy work or to show that something new was going to happen, but to get some thinking in the direction of academic planning. I don't mean to say that none of this was in existence; that wouldn't be fair, but it seemed to me to be the big problem with respect to the program at the time that, while there were some strengths in programs and some of them had grown well, as in psychology—the psychology department—many of them, I think, were just existing. And it seemed to me important they begin planning for their own future, and then these plans should be shared by others on campus.

Nothing formal came of all this; that wasn't my intention. We didn't develop at that time a formal ten-year plan or formal five-

year plan, but it was simply to get faculties and administrators thinking about what they want to be and how they want to get to where they want to be.

I was very impressed with some members of the faculty. A good many of them, as a matter of fact, who obviously were strong people and good scholars and able teachers. There were more of these than I had anticipated, frankly. There were more Charlton Lairds and Robert Gorrells than I had thought to be the case, people who had good reputations and sometimes outstanding reputations around the country. And that's one of the reasons, I guess, that I was a little disturbed that program was—the word *apathetic* might fit program but didn't fit a lot of the people on campus, and [it] seemed to me there was strength here to develop program, too.

On a very personal note, if that's all right, one of the joys of coming to this campus (and this is a very personal thing) was Walter Van Tilburg Clark. I used to tell him, I told him more often than he wanted to hear I'm sure, that I discovered him, and if it weren't for me he'd be a nothing. When *The Ox-Bow Incident* first came out, I was in a bookstore, it'd been out only a matter of a couple of weeks I guess, and picked the book up and started thumbing through it as you do in a bookstore, and was really attracted by his style and by this story, and bought the book and went home and read it immediately. And from that time onward, I read everything I could of his and was an enormous fan of his. I had no idea that I would ever meet this great writer, and I do consider him a great writer. So one of the things that I had looked forward to most of all was meeting him. And the first summer I was here the English department had a summer conference for teachers of English and he was involved (as he often was) in teaching in that. And Dave Hettich came by and took

me to their graduation thing—their last class meeting—to help hand out their certificates of completion and so on, after I'd been here about a month, and I met Walter Van Tilburg Clark, which was a very important personal moment in my life. We became very good friends. And my son, who writes, I think quite well, took Walter's courses—all four of them one year—the one year he was here, and Walter encouraged him a great deal. As a matter of fact, that issue that I bought of *The Ox-Bow Incident*, which I treasured all these years, the last long visit I had with Walter up at Virginia City, I spent an afternoon with him. I took this book up. Kenneth, our son, was in Taiwan at the time and [I] asked Walter if he would join me in a birthday present to my son. If I gave him my most treasured book, would he write something in it to Kenneth, which he did, and it's now become Kenneth's treasure. I'm sorry I got off there, but that's—.

Well, there are a great many people on this campus, some of whom I'd known about. While I was talking about Walter Clark—before I leave him—I think one of the nicest things that's happened to me since I've been here was being able to hood him with an honorary doctorate, which really made it a fine thing.

But there are people—people like [J. E.] Church, for example—who had had international reputations for a great many years. Friends in Ann Arbor asked me, you know—this is the place where Church was; it must be a fine place; he stayed there a long time. Gorrell and Laird, whose names I mentioned earlier— I'd known about their textbooks before I came here. I think sometimes people on campus and certainly people of f campus in the state just are not aware of the quality of people we have at this University. They're really distinguished people, and justly so, well deserving of the reputations they have.

In the last couple of years, as I have talked around the state, I routinely put in whatever speech I'm giving—and the speeches change, believe me—some reference by name (and the names change because we have a wide catalogue of names to choose from) of people who have achieved in the eyes of their colleagues. They're—you know—in every school and college and most departments, you can pick out people who're well known professionally and deservedly so. I think it's important we tell the people of the state about these people, not because they're famous outside of the state, but because it's a good sign of the kind of quality education we're able to provide at this institution for our own people.

One other preliminary thing that I've neglected to mention that I should, because it comes into a thread that goes all through this, is that after I'd accepted the job here, I think the first person other than Charlie Armstrong that I heard from was Bill Thornton, who was president of the Alumni Association at the time, a very nice welcoming letter. That was a very nice thing to do for him as a representative of the Alumni Association and gave me a very good feeling about the institution and its graduates, really to have this kind of welcome. The Thorntons and the Millers have since become very fast friends, but I didn't know him; he didn't know me. But he wrote me a very nice letter, made a big difference.

ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

When I came here in 1965, the basic administrative structure of the University was President Armstrong, who served as the chief administrative officer for both campuses, and reporting directly to him was the vice president for business and finance, Neil Humphrey, and also reporting directly to him (and Neil's function was, as I think I mentioned, the finance and business end of both campuses of the University, and DRI as well). And also reporting directly to President Armstrong was Chancellor Don Moyer at Las Vegas, the director of the Desert Research Institute, Wendell Mordy, whose title later was changed to vice president but at that time he was director of DRI, and myself.

One person who came on board the same day I did, he started his job at the same time, was Ed Pine as physical plant director, chief engineer for the University, and really served both campuses in this capacity, too. Ed's a very interesting person, and an amazing one in some respects. I've often told him that I wish that I had the ability that he had to get as quickly with my job as he did with his,

within a matter of a few weeks, was on top of everything and had done his homework beautifully and could answer any question that you asked him. And we worked closely together, although he reported directly to Neil Humphrey.

President Armstrong and I had, I think, a good relationship all during the time that he was with the University. He was a very intelligent man and I respected him a great deal and it was, as I think I mentioned, very quickly apparent on seeing the University that he had done some fine things for the University and particularly with respect to the faculty involvement in the affairs of the University. I think that lie tended after the reorganization to leave too much in the hands of the people who reported to him, and this sometimes was frustrating. He wasn't easily available. He wasn't on campus a great deal, and sometimes a decision had to be made in his office and—. I think it was a frustration perhaps (I can't speak for the others, but I think it was shared by the others), that it would have been nice to have had him around more.

He had problems I know—it's my impression at least—with Don Moyer, but I don't think—. He and I didn't always agree, and we had the normal kinds of disagreements and problems, but nothing personal, and we got along very well. As a matter of fact, the Fourth of July weekend when I was first here, [was] a very lonely weekend for me because I didn't know many people, and a long weekend—the Fourth was on a Monday and so it was a long weekend—he invited me to his home along with Ambassador and Mrs. Reams. We've often pondered about why that mixture for a Fourth of July celebration as the Reams' and the Millers have celebrated other Fourth of Julys since then. The Armstrongs were really very kind, particularly in the early months that I was here.

He was a strong, vigorous man when he was on the job, and decisive, and I think committed to the University, but as more time passed after first coming here, I think the problems of not being available became worse and worse.

With respect to Neil Humphrey, he and I very quickly made friends and a friendship that has persisted very well over these years. And again this is not to say that we haven't had disagreements, sometimes very strong, and on occasion good shouting match kinds of disagreements. But I think in no case has it interfered with what in my opinion at least, is from my point of view a good healthy relationship between us, and I think we work well together. I think, both have been quite candid and frank with each other about how we feel about matters that have come up and I respect him a great deal. I hope he respects the kind of decisions I have taken too, and I think he does. From the beginning there—he's the kind of person I liked and we got along very well.

Don Moyer [smiles] is a strange person in many ways, and one that I had great difficulty

really in trusting. It was difficult sometimes to know where he stood because he—I was never quite sure I could believe everything he said, and I'm not intending to call him a liar, but he was an "operator", and I think maybe, if that's descriptive, that was the kind of feeling I had about him. He, for example, set up when he first went to Las Vegas, a meeting with three regents from Las Vegas prior to every Board of Regents meeting. And that always struck me as being not quite right, because the three regents then would come then with preconceived decisions on matters after having received only the input from Don.

The Board knew about this; it wasn't subversive or done secretly, and it was maybe done originally as a way of kind of balancing out the imbalance in authority that I mentioned earlier between the two campuses, which I think was real. But it always presented problems because three regents would have Don Moyer's point of view, and that only, and would pretty well have reached some conclusions on the basis of what Don had said.

And sometimes the credibility of things that came from Las Vegas left something to be desired. Enrollment figures were sometimes announced to the press when they were inflated, or statements were made to the press about the necessity for closing down courses when in fact what was really being talked about is the normal condition of a student not being able to elect at ten o'clock in the morning the section of English 101 that he wants, kind of thing. So there were some problems from the beginning in this kind of business relationship with Don. He was a very pleasant person and I still see him occasionally and we remain on very good terms personally, but frankly, there were problems in working with him as a colleague.

Wendell Mordy is a very complex person and was one of the early people I met here, obviously a kingdom builder, and had done very well at this, and very protective of his kingdom. I gather he'd been here for several years, two or three years at least before I came, and I think deserves a lot of credit for apparently getting the Desert Research Institute off the ground and developed. It was a going concern when I got here and has gained strength since then. But his great strength did not lie in administration once the thing was started, and there were the kind of routine things that are inevitably boring to administrators but still have to be done by most of us. Wendell just simple wouldn't do them or they'd get put off so long that— it was difficult to get responses on things. We agreed on a great many things, on some very important matters concerning, for example, what seems elementary, but the value of research. And I have to mention that because then, and even now, to a lesser extent, research is sometimes viewed askance by citizens and the state, or putting money into research at least. I think this is one point of agreement. We both did a lot of talking about the importance of what the DRI was doing as well as research any place in the University.

My impression when I came here was that a good many of the faculty of the University were angry with Wendell, and that continued. And if anything, the numbers grew as time passed, probably because he was so successful in getting this new research activity off the ground, and it was therefore a kind of competitive operation to some other kinds of research going on in Mines and Agriculture and Engineering and other areas. But he was not the best beloved member of the University community by many of the faculty.

While we're on the regents and the administration, in about 1967, during that

year, I think it became clear that there was some unhappiness, on the part of some of the regents at least, with President Armstrong's performance, too. And during the year, '66-'67 I guess, there had been some talk of his retiring or seeking another position. The summer, June of '67, our daughter graduated from Wellesley, and commencement there was on the same day as commencement here, so I asked to be excused from attending the University of Nevada commencement in order to go back and watch her graduate. And Mrs. Miller and I went back for her graduation. I got a phone call that evening saying that at commencement President Armstrong had formally announced his intention to retire from the presidency of the University. This was no great surprise really, because it had been talked about and speculated on a great deal, but I think it probably was the first formal word that this was to take place. He stayed on until about November of the following fall, as I recall, after having served about nine years, I think, at the University, in many ways with distinction. He left to assume the presidency of a consortium of schools in the Miami Valley in Ohio and apparently has done quite well in that position.

Well, with the announced resignation of President Armstrong, in May of 1967, the Board of Regents set up a study of patterns of administrative organization for the University, and they did this partly themselves by inviting consultants in from other state primarily states that had multi-campus activities reporting to a single board. A regent from Arizona and a regent from Oregon, I recall, appeared before the Board of Regents and gave some testimony or opinions about administrative reorganization. They also had a few specialists in educational administration, professionals, who met with them and advised them. But in

addition to this, there was an inter-campus faculty committee, faculty administrative committee, that spent a good deal of time in discussing patterns of organization. There were four, as I recall, four faculty members from each campus and— (at that time) the chancellor for each campus, and one member from the Desert Research Institute, and Acting President Neil Humphrey, and then other consultants. And consultants came to these meetings also. I think there were several matters of concern to the committee, and I can speak more about it than I can of about how the Board felt because, while I attended the Board meetings, they mostly listened and reacted only when they had proposals finally before them. But there was quite a push from Nevada Southern University for a greater degree of autonomy, and this was clearly one of the matters at issue before this committee, how greater autonomy could be achieved for Nevada Southern University.

My original position, as I recall, on this issue, was in favor of a pattern somewhat like the pattern that had existed before: that is, in brief, with a strong central executive officer—president or chancellor. And this would probably mean less autonomy for the two campuses, but it seemed to me at the time would lead to greater efficiency in operation and the greater possibility of avoiding duplication of efforts between the two campuses, duplication of administrative levels, and a variety of other efficiencies that seemed to me important. The autonomy issues seemed to me to be kind of irrelevant. It didn't seem to have as much substance to it as the best way to administer an educational program, so I think as I recall my initial stand was in opposition to this.

Another very important issue was what kind of role the Desert Research Institute would play in any pattern of organization, and

on this one, the stance of the four members of the committee from the Reno campus (from the University of Nevada, Reno) and I was that in effect, the Desert Research Institute should be abolished as an independent agency and its functions merged into primarily this campus. And I say primarily this campus, not because there was any desire to rule Nevada Southern out; as a matter of fact, I think the proposal we finally made suggested that, as appropriate, parts of it go to NSU. But at that point in time, their research activity was very small and their interest in taking on research apparatus was really not great. I recall Chancellor Moyer frequently saying that, "You know, give them time and they'll develop their own research activity." And so I had the feeling that they were not especially eager to accept into the fold some researchers already in existence that might impose a different kind of research program than that they might develop on their own. So we proposed—and it was as I recall a minority report—that the DRI be made a part of this campus operation.

One of the other issues was other programs that were statewide in character aside from DRI, the General University Extension, and Experiment Station activities of Agriculture and the Nevada mining, research and public service activities in the lab and similar programs that were scattered through the University. There was one meeting, I recall, with the deans or directors who were in charge of these activities and, with one exception, they all agreed that these should continue to be part of the operation of this University. The exception was the dean of the College of Agriculture who felt that his program should in effect be split, so that the teaching program reported here and the research and extension activities report to the president or chancellor of the statewide System. This was not a matter of much concern to Nevada Southern

University, and as I recall, Chancellor Moyer supported the position I had taken on this, that these activities—the non-DRI activities—be a part of the administrative structure of this campus.

There was then, and to a lesser extent there's still some, but at that time emotion about DRI on this campus was really quite high. Some of the people who had been involved in research activity on this campus for many years felt the DRI had taken away something from the University when it was created, some kind of special thing about research, and there were some very strong feelings about the way in which DRI was administered, the kinds of salaries that were paid to DRI staff members. (considerably higher than the salaries paid to professors on the campus), about other kinds of special treatment that they felt at least the DRI had, for example, something that's always of great concern to the faculty here, greater freedom in out-of-state travel money. You know, even such a thing as this created quite a strong emotional feeling, so I suspect this was part of the reason for it, and I think the faculty members on this committee probably reflect a pretty general faculty response to DRI.

It's curious, you know, at the same time that there was this feeling about the institution, with a couple of exceptions, I think that Professor Mordy was the target of much of this. But the run-of-the mill (if there is such a thing) DRI staff member, you know, there wasn't this kind of feeling about individuals by and large, with the exception of a few of the top administration. And in fact in those days as now, many of our departments were using DRI people in teaching capacities and so on. But the feeling clearly was very strong and very high and very emotional about DRI. And right to the time the Board of Regents made their final decision at that

board meeting, the position of this campus was that DRI should be a part of this campus operation. The Board decided otherwise, but this was the recommendation from that portion of the administrative reorganization committee, that is this University's portion of it.

Mary Ellen Glass: Professor Mordy sat in on a lot of the meetings. How did he defend his position, and how well did you feel that he did it?

One way in which he defended it—he did sit in on all the meetings, he or someone he'd designate—one defense was to take a strong offensive move on this. He proposed, for example, that DRI in effect be separated from all the University including the Board of Regents, and that it be made a not-for-profit research organization, with its own board, with a board that, as I recall, maybe nine members, three of whom would be members of the Board of Regents, but the other six would be distinguished scientists from around the country much like the advisory committee they had at the time. He reacted very strongly and very emotionally, too, as a matter of fact, [to] anything less than this plan that he proposed. Obviously, this plan was unacceptable both to the committee and to the Board of Regents, too. It probably was in violation of—I think that we may have had an opinion from the Attorney General that it was in violation of the law creating DRI that it had to report to the Board of Regents; it could not be the kind of animal that he wanted it to be.

We had some rather extended and sometimes almost bitter discussions in these committee meetings about DRI. One in Las Vegas I remember—and I'm sorry I don't remember the date, there were so many

meetings of this group— that was really an emotion-charged meeting. I think it was at that meeting that a vote was taken by the committee about a stance on the DRI issue, and the University of Nevada, Reno people turned out to be the minority by one, and the by one was by virtue of a Nevada Southern vote with DRI, so it was a five to four kind of an arrangement. It's my opinion that Professor Mordy did a lot of good, hard homework with the Nevada Southern members of the committee. But that's my opinion only. I think he did a lot of talking with them prior to the meeting.

The final result, officially, was a series of four plans that the committee developed, and these were submitted to the faculties of the two campuses for a vote as guidance to the committee in making the final recommendation. One plan was for retention of the pattern in which the two chief campus officers report to a central executive in all matters. That was pretty much the old status quo. A second would retain a central executive of the system but redefine the authority of the chief campus officers in the direction of increased local authority. And that in fact is the one that finally was—some variation of it was developed.

The third one, abolish the office of central executive, having the chief campus officers report directly to the Board, which would have a staff officer to coordinate all system functions under its direction so that in effect there'd be three officers, that the System officer would be simply a staff member, really, for the Board of Regents and have no line authority. And the fourth one was to create an institutional governing board for each campus, to be coordinated by a master board, the present Board of Regents. The plan that the Nevada Southern group pushed hard was— and in fact some of the Regents from

Las Vegas pushed hard —for abolishing a central executive altogether and having the two campus executives report directly to the Board with nothing in between.

I didn't do any lobbying with the regents myself, in any of them on this; as far as I know, none of the committee did either. I think there were lobbying attempts in Las Vegas, however, with regents. This apparently was the case in terms of what regents would say at regents' meetings, which, you know, was hearing over again what had been said in committee meetings.

There was a good deal of lobbying on campus to get faculty support for the position of the four members of this committee, and with a good deal of success. I think they did fairly well represent the faculty. And if lobbying means explaining the position they've taken, I think they did this very effectively with our own faculty.

On some of these matters the positions were not easily subject to compromise; it was an either-or kind of thing, and attempts to lobby with each other on the committee really were not very effective. Most of it was done in open session and most of it was arguing for or against a given position. There was at least one instance, though, of a lobby. Dean Bohmont, the dean of the College of Agriculture, took his case (without my knowledge) to the Board of Regents, the case about separating the functions of the College of Agriculture, and to my total surprise, showed up at a Board of Regents meeting in Las Vegas. I had no notion he would even be there when this particular matter was discussed by the board, and made a plea in behalf of [laughs] of what he was proposing and very much against the proposal which Chancellor Humphrey and I had presented to the board. I must confess that he was eminently successful, that at that time that's what the board did,

by a split vote, but they did it. So at least that lobby—. He obviously had talked to board members—some at least—individually and then appeared before the board. This did not go unnoticed, you may be sure. He and I had some discussions afterwards. One other matter that was related to this, but dragged on for considerably beyond the time. The basic decision was made [on] the fate of the computing center on the campus, and that's an interesting story.

The board's final decision was the adoption of a plan that chancellor—titles were changed—a chancellor to be an executive of the System, and a president for each of the two campuses, and the director of the Desert Research Institute was to be vice chancellor, period. That decision was made; then there was further discussion about definition of functions of the presidents and the chancellor, and this was an interesting exercise also. Dr. Moyer was adamant about statements that would either be rather vague or that would explicitly limit the responsibilities of the chancellor. And after a good many meetings -of the three of us, Neil Humphrey, Don Moyer and me, we did agree upon a set of statements about the functions of the presidents and the chancellor. He was successful in getting some of it rather vaguely worked, but it did, I think, turn out to be a reasonably good document in describing functions, and was a compromise on some positions among the three of us. It established autonomy and very clearly and fully in some matters; all personnel decisions, for example, were strictly up to the president, and on those the chancellor was not entitled even to make comment on recommendations for appointment or promotions and things of that sort. On matters of policy, the president's recommendation, it was provided, must go forward, and the chancellor would make a recommendation too, either would concur

with the president, [or] he reserved the right to disagree if he wished. But in any case the president was provided the opportunity for complete hearing; It was a compromise and it seems to have worked reasonably well. It's essentially what we now are following. The new code just recently adopted has made some changes in these functions, but not of great significance. The changes are in the direction of more autonomy primarily in fiscal matters in a rather technical way about, you know, who can sign transfers of funds and that sort of thing, and more autonomy for the presidents with respect to the Board of Regents, with respect to promotions and setting salaries.*

Neil was in an "acting" position and simultaneous to a lot of this a committee of board members and faculty set up—I think there were three board members and the chairman of the two senates at the time—and this was set up as a committee to search for a chancellor. I wasn't on the committee. My impression is that they did not do much searching but recommended that Neil Humphrey be designated as the chancellor. And the committee existed for a very short period of time, a month or so. This was their recommendation and then sometime in the Spring of '68, his title was changed from "acting chancellor" to "chancellor."

Maybe I should talk about the computing problem, because that re-brought up some of the issues, especially in the relationship of the DRI on this campus.

The computing operation had been a function—what little we had on this campus and it really was not very large or very up-to-date, but what little we had was

*See Chapter 12, "Documents of Governance."

a function of DRI. And it made some sense to get started that way because the research input in DRI was the major need at the time with respect to computing. So DRI had a computing division, or whatever little they used as part of their operation. The business side of computing was done on some second-generation IBM equipment. As a matter of fact, the research side was on second-generation IBM equipment, a 1640 IBM, as I recall. It wasn't really very sophisticated or very up-to-date, and the fact [was] that there really was a need for better hardware and better software on all three, on teaching, on the business applications and on the research applications. It really brought into focus then where computing should be; that, together with a restricting of the system. DRI very strongly wanted to keep this as part of the DRI operations. This followed pretty much the pattern on the basic discussions about DRI.

The feeling on this campus, and my feeling was too, that computing should be a part of the operation of the campus. My justification for this was that the business applications were, at that point in time, for the whole system pretty well centered in our business office. Nevada Southern did not have a controller or that kind of function, and had a very small staff; most of the work was done here. The teaching utilization of computing was mostly here, and while DRI had a strong argument about the research application, so did we. Much research was going on in many areas on campus that required a computer, so it would seem to me logical that a computer *here*, that could serve DRI, would make sense. This was rather vigorously objected to, as you might guess, by DRI in rather long and actually very bitter statements. I think much of the emotion that had been building about the DRI-University relationship in general

really showed itself perhaps more here than anyplace else. There was a Board of Regents meeting where computing was talked about. There were several when computing was talked about, for literally for hours at a time, until the board wearied of hearing discussions about computing.

One in particular that I recall for obvious reasons, was a presentation by Pat Squires and the DRI on behalf of Wendell Mordy (I think Wendell may not have been in town then; I don't think he was at the meeting) which protested any move of computing from DRI on the grounds that the University, and the president of the University in particular, had already proposed that all of DRI be part of his operation. He'd failed at that (the *he* being me, I suppose), but he had accomplished—according to Pat Squires—essentially the same thing piece-meal. I recall the big sheet of paper fully, oh, three by five or six feet in size, with a series of titles on it. "Nevada Archeological Survey," "Oral History," "Computing Center," a variety of things. And as Pat Squires discussed these—the Archeological Survey which this University had taken over from DRI because funding for the survey was withdrawn by a donor, and I offered to take it on a limited basis, and with the concurrence of everyone connected, I assume. But anyway, as he discussed this, he pulled off the name tag and there was a white cross on the field. Then he came to the Oral History Project and discussed this, and funding had been a problem for that, also. DRI was having some rough financial problems in those days, much more so than in earlier years or than now. And as he discussed this one, he pulled the name tag off and there was another white cross. And it began to look like Flanders Field, [laughs] with the various thefts that had taken place from DRI to this campus. This was so dramatic, I think

it probably backfired [laughs] a little. But I think it demonstrates the kind of emotional feeling that was running high on this.

The board sought some consultants, and it was like a compulsory bargaining session in a sense. As I recall DRI suggested one, or those two together selected the third one, I've forgotten. But we had three consultants then who'd met for a couple of days at the same time about the computing problem.

The final resolution, because it seemed to be the only way to get the show on the road about the new computer and everything else was to make this function a part of the chancellor's operation. The University Press had previously been set aside as a special kind of thing to report directly to the chancellor. The chancellor was not conceived of as an operational unit really, initially, except for the University Press which seemed to have genuine University-wide function. But now the computing center was added as the second operational function of the chancellor's office. This, I think, did not sit well with DRI; it was a satisfactory solution as far as I was concerned. It seemed to me improper for a unit whose sole concern was research to have total control of a very important tool that had teaching and business applications as well. The solution that it had to go to the chancellor's office was quite satisfactory as far as I was concerned.

One of the problems was press releases.

There were some press releases from DRI, clearly presenting their position in this very highly controversial matter, attempting somehow or other to gain support through the press in a way that I never fully understood, because the decision remained with the Board of Regents. And my experience has been that the *last* way to get to the Board of Regents is through the newspaper story

that—you know, do it directly. But there were several releases from Craig Maguire, who was then director of the computing center, and from Wendell Mordy, setting forth in unmistakable language, the advantages of having a sophisticated computing center and why it should be operated by DRI. And that, I think, irritated the Board, too. I don't think it was a very wise way of proceeding in terms of relationships to the Board of Regents.

Another facet of this computing problem was the recommendation that Craig Maguire had made for the computer that he recommended. He did get National Science Foundation support to buy the equipment or to lease it. We had several meetings—several of us. [A] good many of us who were interested in computing met with the—in those days they were called SDS. Those became rather unpopular initials, so they changed to SDX, and I guess they're now part of Xerox.

There were some problems with this group about delivery and in accordance with their contract with us and their promises, and some rather unusual statements from reputable salesmen (I thought) to the effect that, "Sure, we promised you that while we were trying to sell you, but you understand that was just part of the sales pitch, and there's no way we will or can deliver on this." I think a good many of us were unhappy. Then Craig was intent on this company and the contract had been signed and we had to live with some things that later were made right, but the first year or so was pretty rough.

It may be that much of the problems between DRI and the University kind of showed themselves in arguments about computing. It may have been an occasion for some feeling. Lest it appear that I'm anti-DRI, I clearly was not and have not been and am not now. In terms of administrative

organization, I believed at the time, and while I would not argue that way now because of changes in the development of both this campus and DRI, I still think it was the right position then to argue in favor of tying DRI into a teaching operation. It seemed to me to make sense and so I don't apologize for that position. But I have been an active supporter of DRI; I attend, and I've said this publicly many times and said it to the DRI advisory committee and I meant it, I never was out to destroy DRI. I just thought it could be more logically administered in a way in which teaching and research could mesh together better than with a separate organization. And that still seems to me to make some sense, although now I think we've grown so much in different ways that it's no longer a reasonable proposal.

If I can move on, maybe this kind of leads into restructuring of the University, some changes that have seemed to me needed to be made in order to carry out the kind of new functions that were given to the University, most of the new functions being primarily in the direction of more autonomy on personnel, clearly on the business side because we'd had none of that before; now we had it all.

One thing that I think both Don Moyer at Nevada Southern and I both felt right away was the need for more central administrative help. The administrative chore had been rather heavy prior to this because, as I'd mentioned earlier, much of it was kind of left (I can't speak for Nevada Southern but on this campus) to me by inaction, but now it was delegated clearly. And on top of that, Neil Humphrey, who'd been the business officer for the University, now had other functions, so it became necessary first of all, and rather quickly, to seek someone for this campus who could serve as business officer. And we'd

been very fortunate in having as the physical plant director, Ed Pine. So I asked him to serve as business manager as well; he's to be administratively in charge of the business operation as well as the plant operation. He was appointed business manager; the Board of Regents approved this. And then subsequently, of course, his title was changed to vice president for business, and he became then in a line position to the president, in charge of all the business operations, the physical plant, the security, the University police, purchasing, nonacademic personnel, the operation of the dining commons and other auxiliary enterprises.

On the academic side, there had been considerable dissatisfaction on the part of a good many faculty with Dean Ralph Irwin, who was dean of the College of Arts and Science. And *dissatisfaction* may seem to be too strong a word and I think it in some ways was. I think there was always, even on the part of faculty who were dissatisfied with his leadership as dean, a great appreciation for certain kinds of qualities that he had. He was a very conscientious person and very careful, very good at detail work. He knew the University, both present and historically, in a way that almost no one else did. He had at his fingertips all the policies and rules and regulations that were in existence and knew their history. So I don't want to give the impression of a kind of general dismay. It wasn't. There was no revolution underway. But I think there was a felt need on the part of at least some of the younger department chairmen for more vigorous, more modern perhaps, kind of leadership in Arts and Science. I'd known when I came, and I think they had a good point, that some changes were needed.

At the same time this man's qualities, the affirmative qualities, were so strong that he

fitted a need I had. In working with budgets, budget preparation, with managing an office of academic personnel, of a variety of things that called for this kind of careful approach to what was happening. So I recommended and he accepted and the board approved that he be appointed administrative vice president, and this was a staff position really to me; it was not a line position. And it seemed to me a happy choice in terms of both the deanship and in terms of the kind of help I specifically needed at that time. He performed for me in this capacity for two or three years, and beautifully. I can't fault him at all and I think it relieved a problem in the College of Arts and Science.

The third part of my general plan on administration—. The office that Ralph Irwin held, I had in mind as developing upon his retirement into an academic vice presidency, a line position, and this was accomplished and Jim Anderson, the dean of [the] College of Engineering, was appointed subsequently as the academic vice president.

The third part of this was my strong feeling, which I still have but haven't been able to implement, for a vice president for student affairs, student services. And in fact, the position I recommended to the board—the approval of the position, and it has been approved but not filled, so the position is waiting—it seemed to me these three line positions, reporting to the president's office, would provide an effective administrative arrangement in the central administration of the University. The vice president for student services, while not filled, in operation is filled by the dean of students and Roberta Barnes operates as if she were a vice president.

After Ralph Irwin was made vice president in a staff position, this opened the deanship, of course, in Arts and Science. For the first year, Harold Kirkpatrick, who had been associate

dean, served as the acting dean of the college. In accordance with the new organizational pattern and some changes in the *Code*, we did set up a student-faculty search committee with five faculty members and one student on it, as I recall, to conduct a nationwide search for a dean for the College of Arts and Science, nationwide to include the University of Nevada faculty.

They interviewed a good many people from off-campus. The people on-campus that seemed to be likely choices, including Dr. Kirkpatrick and some others in the college like Bob Gorrell and Don Driggs, mostly asked not to be considered for this position at this time. So the search really turned off-campus, and we did interview four or five candidates, and finally the committee recommended as their first choice, and I recommended to the Board, the appointment of Glen Peterson, who was a professor of biology at the University of Colorado and had had some administrative experience with research programs and that sort of thing in biology. He was appointed dean and retained the supporting staff that had been in the office, that is, Kirkpatrick as associate dean and Bob McQueen as assistant dean.

His year with the University was, I think, a very sad one in many ways, both for him, and I think, for the college and for the University. He's a very fine human being and I think part of the problem was that while he'd had some administrative experience, it'd not been much and not in a broad level, as Arts and Science dean would have to deal with, a great variety of kinds of people and kinds of problems. He also had the feeling that his primary function was to represent the faculty and this I concurred with, but on occasions, it became a kind of automatic single reaction to problems that—in my opinion, he sometimes kind of automatically took a position which

was a faculty position without examining the other aspects that necessarily must come in an administrative position.

Perhaps a case in point might be (parenthetically, since you like to get these in), I became involved in a rather bitter, in retrospect tempest in a teapot, but at the time it was an emotionally charged conflict with the department of history during the early months of his tenure as dean. They had recommended through the chain the appointment of a teaching fellow in history who had been dismissed on—oh, dismissed once and contract not renewed a second time from two Nevada school districts where she had been teaching. And as a result, her file really had no positive kinds of things about her from immediate job situations about her effectiveness as a teacher. I refused to accept the appointment. The history department became very unhappy at me about this. I tried to involve the dean as he should be involved in some fashion in this. But what really happened was he kind of backed away from it and I think, was really not of much use either to the history department or me. He refused to take a position; he simply passed on the recommendation of the history department, and I'd like for him to have either affirmed with vigor or denied with reluctance, or something. But it was a case, I think, that showed what I meant that he frequently was simply a conveyer of messages from the faculty, which was not what I hoped he would be.

I think the real turning point, as far as he was concerned though was, he was here during the unfortunate year of Governor's Day and other kinds of confrontations on campus in 1969-70, I guess it was. And as part of the general upheaval of that early spring, there were two or three *confrontations* is the only apt word, I think, in the Union building.

I think two of these—two major ones—in the evenings, on two successive weeks, in large crowds of students. And the dominant voice among the students at these meetings were the black students. We were going through a period of some discussions about the future of a black art professor [Ben Hazard] who had been hired about a year before, and charges were made at one of these sessions by the chairman of the art department that the dean had been reluctant to support him, the chairman of the department, in his efforts to have the man, to give him adequate salary, to help him find adequate housing, and a variety of other things. I think the charges were not true, and Glen Peterson said so much in the meeting and then walked out of the meeting, which was unfortunate under the circumstances. You know, he would have been much better off to have seen it through, but I think was a kind of last straw for him, and from that point on, his decision was to leave and it was one that I didn't fight. I think it was the right thing for him to do.

I think it [was] the combination of not really dissatisfaction, but disappointment on my part and on his part about what a dean's job and a dean's life is really like, plus being here in the most strenuous year of any of the years I've been here at least, all these pressures kind of built up, and making it a very uncomfortable position for him. so he wasn't dismissed; he left on his own accord, but I think with a kind of feeling that mutually, that we felt this was the best thing to do.

Wall, after he left, I turned again to faithful Harold Kirkpatrick and asked if he would serve as an interim dean or an acting dean, and he agreed. By this time, he had, I think, had second thoughts about his earlier decision of the year before when he asked not to be considered. I think the job had some appeal to him. I think he had demonstrated,

in my opinion, real capabilities in this job. And I think that a general faculty feeling in the college was supportive of him. So once again we had a committee that recommended this time his appointment as dean. And this I supported enthusiastically. And he became dean. Within a period really of a few months, and I'm sorry I don't have the date before me, but in the fall of that year after Glen Peterson left, I recommended to the board his appointment and he was appointed as dean.

He served, in my opinion, with real distinction as dean. I think he was a very able person, well respected generally by his colleagues. None of us in administration are universally respected, but I think he had a wide measure of support. He knew the college well because he had been an assistant and associate dean for so long, very conscientious, hard-working, and with some imagination, too. I think he did provide some important leadership to the college. He solved some rather tough problems in some of the departments. The art department was going through a period of real upheaval and the chairman, Charles Ross, about whom I talked a minute ago, resigned from the chairmanship and from the college, from the faculty. There were some problems in the speech department and the biology department, the chemistry department, and we were just emerging with a new medical school that involved a great deal of input from the College of Arts and Science, some of the science departments.

Kirkpatrick, I think, did a fine job with this multitude of various kinds of problems. The unfortunate (and it is very unfortunate) event that led to his leaving the deanship, in my opinion, was just a single instance of extremely bad judgement on his part. I think he made a bad mistake, and once he had made it, unfortunately he felt he had to stay with the mistake. And so I felt, after the hearings and

the guilt on the facts in the case, that I had no choice but to remove him from the deanship. But fortunately he stayed on the faculty. His successor as acting dean was Bob Gorrell who had served previously on a couple of occasions as dean of General University Extension and dean of the Graduate School, in acting capacities and is a long-time faculty member at this University.

One of the problems that Kirkpatrick had (and he was solving this problem), was some problems with the assistant dean on his staff, who was Bob McQueen. My impression is that Bob McQueen was not the most loyal subordinate that one could find. I think that there were some problems between the two of them. Kirk had already made arrangements with McQueen to move him back into teaching before the problem of the travel thing came up.

Perhaps if that'd been done earlier, I think Kirk's life would have been a little happier as dean, too, but—.

The particulars of the problem with Harold Kirkpatrick that led to his being moved from the deanship—. Immediately after the preparation of the budget request for the 1973-75 biennium, which is a trying period for anybody in the administration here, and especially for the dean of the College of Arts and Science, the biggest college on campus and the most diverse and with different kinds of needs that have to be adequately represented. He was tired, no question about it, but he had much earlier—much prior to that—scheduled a trip to a meeting of Slavic historians in Dallas. And before he left, I urged him and Vice President Anderson both, independently as it turned out, each of us had urged him to take a few days annual leave in connection with his trip, which is not the least bit unusual and no one frowns on this to use an occasion to go to a meeting someplace

and then schedule yourself a vacation for *X* days following, so long as you do it openly and everybody knows what's happening. And so he agreed that he would go on to Mexico for a few days. He likes Mexico very much and spent a lot of time there. And as far as we knew, this is exactly what happened. Our impression was, he attended the meeting in Dallas, then left for Mexico and spent a week in Mexico and came back. And when he filed his travel claim, that's what it showed, too.

Somehow, the University System auditor heard that this was not the fact and began exploring this with our records and with the travel bureau where he had made his reservations, and had evidence that in fact he had not spent time in Dallas, but gone directly to Mexico. When this was called to my attention, I called him in and we discussed this. He at first said that that was not so, that he had attended the meetings and then gone on to Mexico. This was late one afternoon.

I get to the office between six and seven [a.m.] or thereabouts, usually. The next morning I was here about six or six-fifteen, and his car was here, and he was here. And I came on up to the office and he knocked on the door in a few minutes and came in and said that what he'd told me the night before was not so, that he had indeed simply changed planes in Dallas, and gone to Mexico. The problem then was a travel claim which may seem insignificant, of about three hundred dollars, approximately, for a purpose which was not what it was purported to be. It was really for vacation time.

And the problem I had then was that this was state money, it's public money. It just is impossible to gloss over this. I have a responsibility about these funds, plus the fact that the form that one fills out for this kind of thing has a statement that declares that you sign these papers under penalty of

perjury if there are errors in it. So we were dealing with a situation really that [had] two possible felonies attached. And the third thing is the general credibility and status of an administrator who misuses funds that are available to him, and even in a particular way, this source of this kind of funds. Travel funds are so hard to come by in this University, and so many faculty members are denied these travel funds for legitimate professional reasons because they're just not available, that this seemed a particularly kind of touchy thing.

The chancellor and I met with the district attorney's office to inform them of this and leave to their discretion whatever action (if any) they wished to take about the potential felony charges. I felt I had no choice but at least to inform them, and did not press for anything other than just to leave it—give them the information, which they took. The other thing that seemed to me had to be followed through on was the instituting of hearings under the Code of Conduct. Not to have done this with a dean would have been grossly unfair to the (by then) half-dozen or dozen students who had been charged with various matters under this code, and I felt in fairness to the whole University community, there should be equal treatment on this.

So a hearing was held. There was much misunderstanding about the whole case, about the facts in the case, and about the kinds of actions that had been taken or that were rumored about to be taken. But it also was the kind of case that I didn't feel that I cared to discuss publicly, nor did he. There were newspaper stories, but I think there was [as] much speculation as fact. The hearing found the facts in the case to be as charged, and that's understand—able because he didn't deny the facts in the case. The sanction recommended was restitution of the money and retention on

the faculty, and the hearing committee split on whether or not he should be retained as dean. My recommendation, or my decision, because the *Code* left the decision to me, and that he be removed from the deanship but retained on the faculty at reduction in salary, because his salary had built up over the years so largely on his administrative position, if we kept him at—. There's no penalty in salary but it was a low salary for his rank, but within his rank salary.

I did get a lot of phone calls, a lot of conversations and a lot of letters, some of them anonymous, as always, on both sides of this. The feeling was strong and a lot of Kirk's friends were as irrational in what they wanted me to do as the people who took advantage of this set of circumstances, who didn't quiet anything, by any means, but I think I got more flack for keeping him on the faculty than I did for removing from the deanship. I think I might add that, while the *Code* left this to me for decision, there is one provision of dealing with a case like this that automatically brings it to the Board of Regents, and that is the board, at least at that time (and this has been modified some in the new *Code*), [which] in those days set the salary for all faculty members. So any change in his salary would have to be approved by the board. I therefore took to the Board of Regents—strictly for information—I did not consult with them about my decision—and I'd been accused of, you know, just doing what I thought the board wanted me to do, which was absurd, because [laughs] what I'm about to say—that I took the salary determination to the board of Regents at an Elko meeting in May, and Elko in May has been terrible [laughs] for me, for I dread those meetings. (To divert, it was in May in Elko that all hell broke loose about the Governor's Day thing at a board meeting.) But to come back to this. The board attendance at

that meeting was slim; as I recall there were seven members of the board present when this matter came up. And they refused to set a salary for him. And the reason they did was that a majority of those who were present then—of the seven—disagreed so violently with my decision on this, that they thought he should've been fired outright, one or two of them even without a hearing, that, you know, I'd been derelict for not firing him the minute this came to my attention.

Chairman Jacobsen was very good about managing this problem with the board [laughs] and managed to get the board by—they got one member of the four against my decision—to agree to vote on a motion to postpone action on this for a month, and at the next board meeting, there was a full attendance of the board. By then some of the heat had died down and the emotion had died down. So my recommended salary for him was approved, but again with three negative votes, you know. There were three who didn't change their mind.

I think the board's reaction—this split in the board was about like the kind of response I got. It was also—as often happens in this state—very much mixed up in political matters. Dr. Kirkpatrick's close friend and attorney, State Senator Coe Swobe, who wanted us—you know, essentially to forgive and forget, but was also willing to [have] some drop-back point like, "Why don't you reduce his salary and—." He even agreed finally with the removal from the deanship. So I think he ultimately was not too unhappy with my final decision on it.

But there were several unfortunate exchanges with him, as Kirk's attorney, and I had reported to me, although I do not know this firsthand, that other politicians in the state, from the governor down, were very unhappy at my failure to fire the man

immediately, again without a hearing, And this I don't understand, but that's the way some people are.

One other thing, before I leave Kirkpatrick. Lest there be any misunderstanding, he's a very good friend of mine, and was and, fortunately I think, still is, and I think our relationship is still a very good one, and I have a great deal of respect for him. And that's what I meant, again, I think he made a very bad mistake, and it was the kind of mistake that I could not ignore. But just for the record, I respect him and I'm sorry this happened.

One of the kinds of things that I had, long before I came here—and it grows. I had a strong working principle in administration and what I'd done earlier in administration in Michigan, and it really kind of grows out of my own research and background prior to being converted or perverted or whatever, into administration. And that is that the research that I've been involved in, that I've read and that I've worked myself with small groups, and some of the research I've done with business organizations, show pretty clearly that the happiest kind of groups and the most productive kinds of groups are those that participate in what they're doing and in the processes of what they're doing. They've some feeling, some legitimate feeling that they really are listened to and that their voices are being heard in decision-making process. Even if they recognize that the decision is not theirs, still if they feel that they've been not just heard but really listened to, the research findings that I'm familiar with show that this is really a very efficient kind of operation in the long run. It's time consuming to do this and therefore it doesn't lead to quick decisions, and that is unsatisfactory to a lot of people in the organization and outside the organization, but the effectiveness of the decision and the motivation of people to carry

out decisions is so much stronger, and their general feeling of happiness about the kind of—or happiness maybe is too Pollyannaish a word—but their satisfaction with their job and their general feeling of confidence in the organization that they are associated with, is much stronger with a participatory pattern of some sort in the decision-making process. I believe this very strongly. And I think it's appropriate, too. It's more than just using some research facts. I think it makes human, logical sense that a person whose whole life for many years, past and future, is tied up with a community, an organization, should have something to say about the things that matter in that organization and that therefore matter to him.

So one of the kinds of things that I've tried very hard to do here is to get as much participation from the University community (and I'm talking now about not just faculty, but faculty and about students and about alumni, and to a lesser degree, too, the people of the state, you know, who have a stake in a public institution) to get some inputs from them that are meaningful in the decision-making process. I recognize, I am the first to recognize that often this is done very clumsily. But I also know that committees as a way of getting this input sometimes slow it down even more, and sometimes are ineffective and sometimes are not representative of the kinds of things that you want to get. That is, they don't often—or they don't always, that is—represent the segment of the community that you want well represented.

But I think a committee still is the easiest way to work with this, because it's a system that's familiar to at least the faculty in a university community. I've tried some other devices with sometimes great frustration, like, until about the middle of last spring, for over a year I tried a monthly forum before every

Board of Regents meeting, using that as a reason for the forum, to try to get opinions or questions or whatever. And I finally gave this up because with one exception these—one time we had a crowd of about a hundred and fifty, but after that the biggest group was about fifteen, and the same ten or fifteen people kept showing up and—it's just easier to have coffee with them than to have a big meeting.

I'm rambling some, but what I'm trying to get at is that, one of the criticisms that I'm well aware of that's been aimed at me, and it's one that brought to head a good deal of the strong feeling of Regent Morris and Regent Steninger, was, as Regent Morris says, "You don't run that University." And I agree with him. You know, I don't run it. I don't want to run it. I'm well aware that I have to make final decisions on some things; we just talked about the Kirkpatrick case as a kind of thing. On most things I do have to make some decisions, and I'm willing to do that. I never have run from doing this, but before I do, I'd like to get as much input as possible and as much as feasible with the time allowed and whatever other parameters are around that particular decision. This has led to the criticism of "referring everything to committees;" not everything gets referred that way, but a lot of things do, and to the criticism that it's slow. But I think sometimes committees can work very rapidly, and they have on occasions here. Sometimes, well, speed is a vice rather than a virtue; you know, sometimes second thought that time allows can produce better decisions than doing something rather quickly. So as long as I'm around I still want to rely as much as people are willing on getting as many people involved in the life of the organization as I can.

A university is a very peculiar social organization. And it's a very difficult one to administer because of these peculiarities.

And one set of things that's relevant to what I'm talking about now that's unusual about it is that control is amorphous and diffuse and varies so much on different kinds of things. And control is so different from official channels. You know, there're official and unofficial kinds of ways of viewing the controlling mechanism of the University. In many ways a university is so different from a military organization or a business organization or even than a social club (which is much more autocratic in the way it operates than is a university). It is and it ought to be a kind of loose social organization that should, it seems to me, involve something closer to coordination and expediting things than to authoritarian kinds of dicta about how things should happen.

Every member of a faculty is, you know, in a way his—the captive of no one. He's his own boss and his own judge of what's right about what he's doing. And yet he has to live in a community where there has to be some correspondence of activities, some overlay of some agreement about the mores of that community in which he lives. You know, you have to deal with certain kinds of accepted norms about how much a person teaches or whether or not he's expected to do certain other kinds of things with respect to his department or his university. So some things are social norms that develop, and are better developed as social norms than as rules laid down. And I think universities have developed these pretty well. But you can't escape the fact that you're dealing with people who are by the very nature of their profession necessarily independent one from another, even colleagues in a department are—must be—you know, independent and yet inter dependent, too.

I'm afraid I'm rambling around. Maybe I'm rationalizing an approach to administration

of higher education that I think is a vital one and it's one that I'm well aware has created some problems for me and for the University, too. But I really believe that it's not because I'm afraid to make decisions, because I have made decisions always, and will continue to, and often unpopular ones. But I think my decisions are more apt to be good decisions if other people who are involved in them have a chance to get their say about them. That's really the simple way of getting what I've tried to say.

You know, this, what I've been talking about on the tape is a lot easier to apply when you're talking about faculty or students. I think it is. Because they're right here and the relationship between their lives and the life of the social organization is so abundantly clear. But I mentioned earlier that there is and probably should be, a connection with that other constituent, the people who own the university in a sense, that is, the people of the state. And I think they do have an input. I think they should have. I think the kind of input they should have is to make determinations about the general kind of institution they want and what kinds of purposes they want it to serve. I think for example that a very proper question to take to the Board of Regents after administrative and faculty and students, is the issue of what type of admission policy, or should it be more restrictive? Should there be restrictions on numbers of out-of-state students and in-state students and so on? I think the same kind of input in terms of broad areas of curriculum, the question of the medical school, which we haven't talked about much, but seems to me that was a proper thing for the citizenry of the state, as they did, to get heavily involved in, because it does something to the nature of the institution and its purposes and the ways in which the institution serves the people of

the state. I do not believe that it's at all feasible for the people of the state to administer a university; that is to say, once a decision is made about a medical school, let's say, for them to then appoint faculty or to decide which courses would be offered or to tell what should go into the building. You know, these are matters of implementing a decision that has been made. Maybe my simple examples will make the point of what I'm talking about.

In this state, part of the problem is drawing the line between what kind of inputs are proper and which should be left to the professionals, really. And again, it's a function really, of I think something that many people are aware of, the size of the state, and—something I've talked about earlier—and the general feeling of everybody knowing everybody else and in some way knowing everybody else's business too, which is both good and bad. This has led sometimes to some—not sometimes, but almost daily [smiles]—to suggestions, demands, criticisms, about the day-to-day operation of the University. Many of them because of some things that have happened here; many of them center around student activities, and the kind of demands about these often are police kind of demands that, “Why don't you throw out such-and-such a student who did this, that, or the other?” That, it seems to me, is not a proper kind of input from the general public. Concerns about the general climate for students on the campus, maybe that is, but how a particular student behaves should be left up to the people internally who know more of the facts and who are in a better position to judge the relationship of a particular act, other kinds of things that happen and to make judgments about how important or unimportant it is, and so on.

I think because of the kind of state we're in, that subconsciously, this tends to make these

pressures—these almost daily pressures about everything about the University— probably tends to make us all more conservative than we would be if they weren't there. And maybe that's good, I don't know. But I think we tend to be a little more cautious about the frequency with which we suggest that ROTC should be voluntary, for example, than we'd be if there were not these outside pressures. It hasn't stopped us from requesting that it be voluntary, but I think maybe we don't do it as often as we would [laughs] if there weren't these pressures.

I try very hard, and I hasten to say, too, that I get a lot of communications in support of the University and in support of particular actions that have come from this office—probably in balance not as many in support, but that's to be expected. People are freer to criticize negatively than they are to support on anything. I interpret a lot of the criticism from people in the state as being a sign of affection for the University, but displeasure with a particular thing that happens here.

I think as I talk about students and about some of the events—troublesome events that've occurred—-maybe I can come back to this in a more particular way. I think [that] will be a thread that will run through some of these other things, too.

We do make an effort to get reactions from people in the state, and we do it in a variety of ways. A good many of the schools and colleges on campus have very active citizens advisory committees, and the citizens advisory committees in medicine and agriculture and home economics, for example, are quite active and very useful ways of getting an input from the citizens in the state in those areas about how they react to things and what kinds of programs we should have, and so on.

One of the reasons for the creation of an office of Community Relations (and I'll talk

more about that office later) is to discover ways of getting this kind of input, and I think one thing that Dean Basta has done very effectively in this local area, is to set up for the past year and a half or so, a series of symposiums and seminars about the University. Rather than our just telling the community about us, he's very successfully brought in community leaders who either sit around the table and share ideas or make speeches to us as we do to them. And it's a way of communicating, both their desires about the University and our concepts about the kinds of things that we want to be doing here. I try every year to get out in the state to do as much speaking as I can. I rarely turn down an invitation to speak to a Rotary club or a Lions club or a chamber of commerce any place in the state. I find this, from my point of view, very useful. People are quite candid. They're very nice, but they're also quite candid, and I try to be with them. I don't try to deceive about the fact that we have men and women living, hopefully on separate floors, but in the same dormitory. In some areas of the state, that's not a very happy thing to talk about, but I think it's important that we talk about it.

It's interesting to me; I thoroughly enjoy those contacts. To go to a place like Eureka or Austin and for a luncheon meeting sponsored by the chamber of commerce or some other groups and have in attendance as much as twenty-five to thirty percent of the whole population of the town, is really a very interesting experience. And you get the feeling that you are getting some notion about how that particular community feels about the University.

Dean Basta, I think, has been particularly successful and in taking students from the University out to the community. And that's again a two-way street. It's a way of getting some feedback from the community of the

students, but it also lets the community see that they're not all wild-eyed radicals. So we are deliberately making some efforts to get this kind of input and communication. We do the same kind of thing through publications and Ed Olsen (the information office), through his news releases, and through very active work with the Alumni Association, which is a very important part of this. The Alumni Association quite properly occupies a rather important place in my scheme of thing; I think quite properly. I don't spend as much time with them as I do with faculty or students, but they nonetheless have a high priority when—. Homecoming may be a dying affair, but I value the chance of visiting with the alumni who are coming back, whatever the reasons are, even if it's just to see the football game.

Well, that's some of the kinds of ways that we try to get the input and explain ourselves, too.

The question is, what kind of day do I spend on a typical day? I should say first, there is no such thing as a "typical day." Every one of them is sufficiently different in time commitment and in the nature of the problems that come in that that's one of the things that keeps this a very interesting kind of experience. It's certainly not an assembly-line kind of job by any means I But I'll deal with maybe a kind of composite typical day.

I should say that first, I usually get here between six and seven in the morning, sometimes earlier, and try to spend the hour and a half or two hours before eight o'clock basically catching up on desk work, on correspondence. I dictate letters and that sort of thing. In the morning [I] try to spend some time with reports and documents and committee minutes and things of that sort. As they come in the previous day, I try to read them the next morning.

I usually try to keep the hour from eight to nine kind of free. After the secretaries are here, there usually some things that they want some time for, or it's also a good time for emergency appointments; things that can't be worked in during the day, we can squeeze in during that hour. So Jean Baldwin usually tries to schedule in advance meetings or conferences or whatever between nine and—oh, nine o'clock on.

Once a week, at least regularly, I meet with a kind of central administrative group made up of the two vice presidents and the dean of students, and we spend, usually on a Monday morning from nine to ten-thirty or so, just sharing ideas, experiences, dealing with problems from their own areas or general University problems. And this, I think, has served a very useful function as a communication device among these three people, the dean of students and the two vice presidents. So on Mondays, the morning usually begins formally with that. Typically there would be at least one—something prior to nine o'clock—a student who has a problem, or a faculty member who has a problem, or in rare cases, some telephone messages left over from the previous day, although I try to respond by telephone as soon as I can to messages that have been left, because I know how it is to sit by the phone and wait for it to ring. So I try to get that done before the end of the day and hopefully, within an hour after I got a phone call.

But typically, there would be something between eight and nine, and then nine o'clock, this meeting. There follows then for the rest of the day, a whole variety of things, and it's kind of difficult to categorize them, but maybe a few examples might serve this purpose. This morning, for example, I had a meeting with the dean of the Graduate School, who serves as a kind of research coordinator for

the campus and a member of the faculty of the General University Extension who had a contract for some research—or for some teaching activities sponsored by federal funds—paid for by federal funds. And it was a real technical problem about how he could spend these moneys; there's no point in getting into their particular problem. But it was the kind of thing that called for an interpretation of University policy and so they came to me with this, and this was about forty-five minutes discussion.

I once or twice a week, will have visits with faculty members who have some kind of problem, often related in a broad sense to conditions-of-work kind of thing, but not always that. Oh, maybe about problems with their colleagues or with their dean or perhaps to inform me about a job offer or something of this sort. Students come by frequently and sometimes without appointment, and I try to see them when they come in; especially if they have an appointment, of course they come in, but even without them. The things they want to see me about are so varied.

Just to take a recent case in point, Rick Elmore, the student body president, came to see me, not between eight and nine, but between twelve and one, during the noon hour, last Thursday or Friday. He had a real problem from his standpoint (and I think it was one) with the director of athletics, about some equity in the use of tickets. And, you know, he was interested in getting a resolution to this problem at least prior to next week's football game, the problem being that members of the faculty who spent fifteen dollars for the year for an athletic ticket could bring all the members of their family to a football or basketball game or whatever, while a student who spent the same amount of money could not bring even one guest to a game. And there was a time problem because

of the football season, but he felt that this needed attention right now. So that's one kind of thing.

A faculty member last week who had been given notice that his contract would not be renewed felt that he had been—he'd been on a probationary appointment, but felt his evaluation in his department had not been fair. Again, he wanted to see me right away, not because there was a time pressure, but because there was an emotional pressure in his case. So he came in, either eight or eight-thirty in the morning. Well, these examples serve to illustrate the kind of emergency that I'm talking about.

Once in a while, even, a student will storm out of a class [laughs] and will come here with a complaint about an instructor who's said something the student didn't like or treated the student in some fashion that he felt was unfair. Well, there are emergency kinds of things in the eyes of the people who had them (and therefore they are emergencies) that come along almost every day—not every day, but almost every day. It's a community, you know, of about ten thousand people all told, and it's not just faculty and students; others too, the non-academic group. I get visits from secretaries and other who've heard rumors about separation from the state personnel division, having a separate University personnel division, and this excites them. Or about alleged unfair treatment, somebody making more money and in a higher classification than someone else. And often to someone else these don't seem important, but they are vitally important to the people who are concerned about them, and I think deserve therefore some kind of immediate attention, even if sometimes all I can do is just listen. And frequently, the end result of something like this is a referral to someone who properly should handle the

problem. But I think it serves a purpose for them to be able to come here, and I think this is an important part of my job.

I also, during this typical day (and this means maybe two or three times a week now), will have a meeting of some sort. I'll meet with one of the committees on campus or with a kind of an *ad hoc* grouping of people who talk about—who knows what. A recent case in point was the kind of relationship that the University should have with the Nevada State Museum, whether or not we can strengthen connections in one way or another; and it was really that open. So I called a meeting of people like the chairman of the anthropology department, of the art department, of biology department. This is not a committee thing, but a group of people who had some interest in this area and who could talk to this point. On other occasions it's a committee like the radio and television board, or some other group that has a particular thing that they want to talk about. So that, fairly often, is part of a typical day, and these would be usually about an hour for a meeting like this.

Lunch hour is nearly always business-connected in some fashion. About once a week I eat on campus at the Pyramid Lake room, or about once a month I eat in the dining commons, just go through the line, and at noon, and two or three times a month in the dining commons, either breakfast or dinner, too. And the reason for this is, it's a good informal way to make contact with students, but also the health service and the dining commons and the parking—those three—are the chronic points of complaint among students, and it's kind of useful for me to have been there myself and know what they're talking about or to be able to say that I—you know—"I've eaten there, too, and that never happened to me" kind of thing. Aside from that, about one day a week—I belong to

Rotary Club in town and they meet at noon on Mondays and I try to get to as many of those meetings as I can. Or I will have lunch either with a faculty member or a student or a dean. But most usually, a lunch downtown with someone downtown, on University business. Someone like [H. Edward] Ed Manville who's chairman of the citizens advisory committee for the medical school, I try to have lunch with him about once a month, every six weeks or so. Or with people who either are or will be, I hope, donors to the University, or politicians Neil Humphrey and I had lunch last week with Bill Raggio, [who] is a candidate for state senate. So I never get home for lunch, and it's usually, except for about one out of five days, it's usually a business-connected thing.

The afternoons are much like the morning, with appointments with people. There was a study at Ohio State University about ten years ago, about communication in the business world, and as I recall the results of that study, that business executive from the junior level up sent about eighty-five percent of their working day in communication situations of one sort or another and about seventy-five percent of that time was in oral communication situations. And I think that pattern pretty well fits my typical day, too.

I usually try to get away sometime between four and five, but it's more likely to be between five and six, on a typical day. I constantly keep after Jim Anderson and Ed Pine, because they put in long hours and are here on weekends frequently, to plan regularly to take an afternoon a week off, and they keep telling me the same thing. I've resolved several times to try to do this, and I've done it maybe oh, two afternoons a year [laughs] —just leave at noon on a Tuesday or Wednesday or something and not come back. But that doesn't work too well. Work piles up, the next day is harder, and the phone rings at home and so I might as well be here.

About half the evenings are taken up with University-related activities of one sort or another; cocktail parties, or dinners or meetings, and sometimes back on campus. Sometimes they're purely social affairs, but in many cases I have no illusions about why I'm invited there, and I think it's important that the University be represented. So an evening at home, just with nothing to do, is a kind of rare event. When this happens I try to take some work home, and usually get about an hour's work done—not a whole lot though [laughs]. So it's not very productive time. About once a month, I just collapse in front of television and watch whatever comes on and that's kind of a dull, but refreshing kind of thing to do once in a while.

Well, once in a while I take my wife with me on a trip, and she enjoys this because we can spend time together. We see each other frequently; we have a very close relationship, and so even when I'm just passing through the house, taking a shower and changing my shirt, you know, we see each other. And we do get off for a vacation now and then—I think only once since I've been here for the full four weeks, though. We did, about two years ago, drive back to Boston to see our daughter and son-in-law and grandchild and spent about three weeks on Cape Cod, and that was great. The rest of the time is four, five days in San Francisco—that kind of vacation. But even that's very nice, and it really makes a difference. I'd like to be able to do this more often. Vacation time is there, but getting away is difficult

On weekends, if I'm in town I usually come to the office about seven o'clock on Saturday mornings, but I usually leave around noon and go home and in the summertime, mow the lawn and in the wintertime, build a fire in the fireplace and read or do something like that. And on Sunday, depending upon

how work is built up, I may or may not come to the office; usually I do for two or three hours, but the weekend is obviously more leisurely and serves the purpose of getting a little refreshment.

I'm not complaining though; I think much of this is—some of it is just sheer inefficiency. And I think that's a true statement, that if I were more efficient I could get things done more quickly, and that's especially true about paper work. For example, I really should learn to make some better differentiation than I have about what I read. You're a chairman of a committee and I've assured you that I would read all your committee minutes and I do, including one that just came yesterday or Friday or today. And, you know, maybe I should learn to skim better, but as I said earlier, I think if I ask people to become involved, then I have a kind of obligation to them to keep up with the way in which they're involved. So I don't know. I'm sure there are some efficiencies that if I tried harder I could work out. But I really think I would not be happy, I know my conscience would hurt me if I tried to keep a straight eight-to-five kind of calendar and forget about the job when I went home. But I don't think that—you know, that's not the nature of this kind of job. Some jobs you can do that, but I think you're not earning your way if you do it here.

So I'm not complaining at all. I don't want to be misunderstood. I think it's just a—. I enjoy, you know, ninety percent of it. Some of it is dull routine; that's part of every job too, and I don't always enjoy that but I wouldn't be here if I didn't think—you know—get some satisfactions out of it, and there are some. It's tiring sometimes, but I sleep well at night, thank goodness, and I usually try to get to bed, when I can, oh, between ten and eleven, and between that and five or five-thirty is enough sleep.

It sounds like I'm, you know, begging for sympathy; I am not. I do this because I want to do it and because it's the way that I feel that I can operate best in the job. Other people do it different ways, and that's fine, and probably better, so that's great, too.

Well, you're so much more accessible to people, too, than some previous presidents have been, isn't that true?

I hope that I am more accessible. Sometimes this has some strange and odd moments to it. I recall at one point, about three years ago, when the great cause on the campus was some charges brought against a black athlete, Jesse Sattwhite. The charges were threatening a member of the faculty, as I recall, and it was prior to the development of that disciplinary code, and so everybody was a little bit uncertain about how you proceed with a set of charges like this. And I was in my office, and I don't think anyone was here at the moment, but I heard a *loud* noise coming up the stairs and in my office came unannounced and obviously with no appointment, about thirty students, very angry, about two-thirds of them black students and the others white, and they clustered around my desk and about three or four deep. And what they wanted from me was the copy of the charges against Jesse Sattwhite. Jesse was there. And I said I wasn't gonna release it, that, sorry, that I considered that something between Jesse and me and it was not—as a matter of policy, would not release charges against anybody to the public or to the press or anyone else until the matter comes up for a formal hearing and they become public knowledge. There was a lot of shouting and a lot of literal desk-pounding by some of them, including Jesse.

Well, as the group came through the corridor on the first floor, Ed Olsen, the

director of information, heard this group and saw them, and he followed them upstairs to see what it was about. He, because of his physical problem, didn't get here until after they were well established and had made their point.

So finally I said to the group, "The only way you're going to get a copy of these charges is if Jesse is willing to release it to you." And that came as a new idea to them.

Somebody said to Jesse, "Will you let us have a copy of the letter he wrote you?"

And he said, "Sure, here it is." Pulled it out of his pocket [laughs].

And Ed Olsen said, "Fine. Bring it downstairs and if Jesse's willing, I'll run off as many copies of it as you like on the Xerox machine," whereupon they left. Problem solved.

In times of stress, this kind of interruption is not unusual. Again, the problem of the Black Student Union office, during the week it was kind of hanging fire, I had a similar experience with a group of black townspeople who came into my office one day, interrupting a meeting, kind of took over, and wouldn't leave.

These things happened after the [BSU] occupation and the taking the students out, and during the time they had been charged, both downtown and on campus, with violations. So it was a very live matter. One morning about nine or nine-thirty, I finished talking to someone who left, and the outside office was full (it seemed full; there were actually, I guess, eight or ten, twelve) of people who simply walked in. With, I think, two exceptions, they were black, and *very* angry and very militant, and representing themselves and representing, they said, some other organizations in town like the Northeast Outreach group, and affiliated in various ways with the Economic Opportunity program

downtown as members of the advisory board, and this sort of thing. Although they did not purport to be spokesmen for the groups, they identified themselves as having these connections. They were very angry that the [BSU] incident* had taken place, and even angrier that it was still continuing, the thought being that once they were expelled from the office, that that should take care of it, you know, it was over and done with. They made this point very clear to me, and in very loud fashion. At one point I said to them that I could sympathize with their position, I sympathize with the students, but nonetheless, we did have rules, both on the campus, and laws downtown, and there was an alleged violation of these rules and these laws, and that it had to be followed through. It was like restitution of stolen property, that nonetheless, the act had taken place, and so it had to have a follow-through. [I said] that we would do everything we could to try to solve the basic problem, which was office space, and I explained to them what kinds of things had been talked about earlier, and what other possibilities there might be, both present and in the more distant future, like the time we expand the Union. This made no impression. I suppose I didn't really expect it to; I did make the point.

At one point, they began threatening, and I asked them to leave. And their threats were that, you know, "If you don't drop these charges, and if you don't get office space, we're going to picket this campus, and we're going to crowd the hearing room," this kind of threat, not a personal harm kind of threat.

And I said to them, you know, "I don't think this is the place for threats. If our conversation has come to the point where that's all we can talk about, I think the interview's over." And I stood up and nobody else did. I said, you know, "If this is all we have to say, I'll ask you to leave my office."

Whereupon one of them very properly said, "It's not your office. It belongs to the people of this state, and we are the people of this state." She was right, of course [laughs].

So one or two of them, who had been quiet, said, "Well, let's do talk about some constructive thing that can be done."

We talked another thirty minutes or so, and they left, not happy, by any means, but I think assured that ultimate action would take place, but there would be no dropping of the charges. That's really all there is to the story, but it was an interesting two hours of unexpected confrontation.

Then during that same time period (I'm sorry I don't have the exact dates, but within a two-week period), one morning I was in a meeting with Vice President Anderson, and I was sitting where you're sitting [at the conference table, facing the door]. He was sitting here [at the conference table, back to the door], and the door opened suddenly, and here were about a dozen black students who came in. The leader of this group was Tex Barrett. He came in and—they obviously had rehearsed this very well. They sat down. Tex told them where to sit around the table, and a couple of them sat on the couch, but he left this chair at the head of the table open, and then he said to me, "You sit up there."

And I said, "What for?"

And he said, "Because we're going to have a trial, and we want you in the prisoner's seat."

And I said [laughs], "What kind of a trial are you going to have, Tex?"

And he said, "For... I've forgotten," and he pulled out a piece of paper with some charges on it, and he read it, a hand-written piece of paper, about my threatening the lives of

*See Chapter 6, "Special Problems of Campus Minorities."

students by having police take them out of the office, or something of this sort. Incidentally, he had left the chair on his right empty. He sat there—he left the chair on his right empty, too.

And he said, “I now call my first witness.” And he said (I’ve forgotten, Jesse Sattwhite, or someone), “Take the witness stand.”

And I said, “Tex, you know, I’m not going to have any part in this kind of absurd operation. If you’ve got something you want to say to me, go ahead and say it. But nobody is on trial here, and if that’s all you want to do, is play this game, you can leave.”

And they fumed around a little bit; I wouldn’t move. He kept asking me to take the seat up here [head of conference table]. His first witness Came and sat down, but they became diverted, I guess, by what I was saying to them, so that he never got into the cross-examination or the calling for testimony from his witness. He obviously was getting no place. He was adamant, but about half the group started drifting away, you know, the game wasn’t gonna be played, it was clear to them. So finally, they all just kind of drifted away, and you knew kind of anticlimax all the way around.

Jim [Anderson] just sat here, a strange and bewildered look on his face. I must confess, I was glad he was here. He’s bigger than I am, if it would come to this. Well, those are two related things. There was a good deal of emotionalism about the whole problem. Maybe those two things illustrate that.

So there have to be interruptions of this sort in periods of stress.

The Academic Council—I don’t know how long it’s been in existence; it was here before I came. It basically is the council of the academic deans on campus. And when I first came here, Chancellor Moyer and I

were added to the Council, and as I think I mentioned sometime earlier, President Armstrong’d asked if I would chair the Academic Council. Prior to that he had chaired it and met with it regularly. It really dealt with all kinds of matters of University policy, a wide range of things like admission policy, and the mechanics of registration, a lot of very down-to-earth, practical kinds of things that deans would be concerned about, advising problems. Through this body all new courses in the University were approved, and deletions of courses; all of this came before the body. It also served as a kind of University personnel committee. All recommendations on promotions and tenure were processed, in those days, and until quite recently, through the Academic Council. So it met regularly once a month.

When I became president, or chancellor or whatever, the administrative head, really, of this campus, I changed the makeup and the function somewhat of the Council by adding to it some other people. I think prior to my becoming president, I think I had added the director of the library to it, who had not served on it previously. But then we added also the then business manager because many of the problems that came up related to the business functioning of the University. And the director of the summer session, and ultimately the dean of students and then later the vice president for academic affairs. So it became really a kind of council of the heads of administrative units, more than strictly an academic deans group, and I think, served better with the kinds of things it dealt with. We have slowly been removing from this council certain functions. We’ve created a special University-wide committee on promotions and tenure which is made up teaching faculty. And they do the screening part, University-wide, after recommendations

come from colleges, on recommendations on promotion and tenure, rather than the Academic Council.

One reason, or several reasons that this seemed wise to me, one was that there would be a kind of unadmitted (and I'm sure no one would admit it), but nonetheless real kind of trading of f among the deans; you know, unspoken and unwritten, really, I'm sure, but, "Okay I'll vote for this doubtful person that you've presented, expecting you to vote for a doubtful candidate that I might present now or later for promotion or recommendation for tenure." So there was a kind of political trade-off at least possible, and I think maybe in operation. And that did not seem to me to be the right way to evaluate faculty for promotion and tenure. And the other aspect of this was, we already have, at that stage, a recommendation from a dean, and it seemed to me a good idea to let a faculty group apply some criteria that they may develop about worthiness for promotion or the granting of tenure, rather than getting other deans in the act. So that function's been taken away, but it's a very useful body for communication among the colleges and for some recommendations still on matters of admission policy, on quality performances reflected in grading policy, on the development of calendar, which sometimes can be a very important policy kind of thing. So they have some real and very important problems to deal with, although they've changed some. Maybe the biggest change has been in this personnel action kind of thing.

I no longer chair it. The academic vice president chairs it, but I do meet with them. I attend all their meetings when I'm in town. They don't reschedule if I'm out of town, but if I'm here, I do meet with them and participate, as appropriate.

I think there's a great deal of misunderstanding around the campus,

although less now, about this body. It's been viewed as a kind of mysterious star chamber, I think, in the past, and I think two things have begun to change this kind of faculty attitude toward it. One is the removal from it of the personnel functions, which takes away much of the hostility toward it. And the other, Jim Anderson, since he's been presiding, has, I think very wisely, distributed copies of the minutes of the meeting pretty widely across campus. And that's good. I think that's helped considerably, and I'm glad he thought of it. It never occurred to me and I think it's a good idea.

It meets once a month, and about every six weeks or so, I call essentially the same group together, sometimes with some other people added. We often have a breakfast meeting, without an agenda, just to talk about, oh, sometimes we've done this right after a Board of Regents meeting or right before one, to talk either about the agenda or things that occurred at a Regents meeting. It's kind of semi-social, semi-business thing. This is not on a regular basis, but maybe six or eight times during an academic year, we'll have usually a breakfast meeting of this sort. And that I do call and it's kind of my meeting. It's not the Academic Council *per se*.

While we're on this, maybe just a little about the faculty senate might be in order. When I came here, the senate was called the University Council, and I'm sorry I don't recall the nature of the makeup of it, but it had both administrators and faculty members, and my recollection is it was a somewhat larger group than the present senate, with twenty-one or twenty-two members. The present senate really grew out of the reorganization of the University in the kinds of things that I've talked about earlier here. It's made up of two groups, one of them slightly different from the other. The senate itself is made up

of the senators, and they're elected by schools and colleges, plus the election of the senators who represent non-teaching units, called in the *Code* "components." Of the twenty-one or twenty-two senators, there are four or five who represent such groups as librarians, county agents, audio visual—groups that are not actively engaged in teaching, and yet are very much a part of the University community. So the other part of the senate is what is a sub-group of the senate called the Undergraduate Council, made up only of those senators who represent teaching units, and it's that group that deals with problems related only to [the] teaching function of the University. The recent recommendation from the senate about the ability to change an "F" grade to a "W" grade, was really something dealt with by the Undergraduate Council of the senate, because it dealt only with a teaching kind of situation. Matters of salary, of faculty welfare, of calendar, these all come to the whole Senate.

I think the senate has worked very well. I think it's a responsible body. Like most legislative bodies, it's sometimes cumbersome and slow on problems that may have some urgency, but I would prefer that to having—again I've talked to this point earlier—efficient but sometimes unwise solutions to problems. I've found them to be very responsible people. The senate elects each year, one of its members to serve as a chairman of the faculty senate, and I think we've been especially fortunate here with the quality of the chairmen we've had. They've chosen quite well indeed, and I say this without any exception. I think there's not been a weak chairman of the faculty senate since it's been in existence as a senate and since I've been here. And they've been pretty well spread around campus. There have been senate chairmen from the College of Education, couple of them from the College

of Agriculture, Arts and Science. The fear that I think many of the smaller units had was that Arts and Science would dominate this group as the largest college on campus, and I think that's not been borne out. I think they have a few more votes than the smaller colleges, but they certainly have not dominated it, by any means.

*What kinds of problems do they bring to you?
And what's your relationship?*

Well, the senate really is—its most important function is to deal with educational policy, and it is quite properly the place where much educational policy originates. Grading policy, for example, that I mentioned earlier, was initiated within the framework of the senate. That may be some individual's idea, but it gets official attention first either in a committee of the senate or in the senate as a whole. So all educational policy matters like that, working conditions of faculty, like teaching loads, like salaries, are also a primary concern of the senate. Fringe benefits, many of these originate again in the senate. Or in many cases, if a problem area comes to my attention, from whatever source, from an individual or a committee or a board that I have appointed, or sometimes from the regents who refer something back for faculty reaction, then frequently I refer to the senate matters that have come to me for their response. The response may be a response of the executive board of the senate, or it may be of the senate itself, or quite often on what they determine to be important matters, [the chairman] would call for a vote of the whole faculty. The status of ROTC as required or voluntary is a kind of case in point. Where on some occasions the senate has originated a proposal that it be made voluntary, on other occasions the ASUN has originated this and sent it to me

as a statement of policy or belief on the part of ASUN. Then in turn I've referred this to the faculty senate, since it seems to be a University-wide kind of thing. Or still using this as an example, it's conceivable that the military affairs board, which I appoint, could make a recommendation about something about ROTC. But I would refer this to the senate, and in the case of ROTC, to ASUN as well, before I send something to the Board of Regents. So they're very deeply involved as representatives of the whole faculty and in the setting of educational policy, and I think have managed the affairs of the faculty really quite ably. I attend, again, attend their meetings, not as a member, but they have invited me and I go to all of them and therefore I can listen to the quality of the debate that takes place on issues as well as the final result, and I think it's good. It's a good healthy thing.

Do you see any problems with this kind of structure? Do they get into areas of conflict?

Oh, once in a while I think this is inevitable and they fuss at me occasionally for not referring things to them.. And sometimes they're right, I agree, and sometimes I think they're wrong, that it's not the kind of thing that should have been referred for one reason or another. And once in a while I fuss at them for getting into an area that seems to me totally administrative, that's not really worth their time, or that really is the function of somebody else. By this I mean something that should be handled by the faculty of a given college. I do not think that—you know—that kind of sovereignty of a college should be taken away by a senate. But usually, you know, we can talk about these gray areas ahead of time and decide whether or not—. The chairman of the senate or the executive committee of the senate and I can meet

together—and frequently do—about whether or not a given matter is an appropriate thing for the senate to deal with. And it works out well. There haven't been any major conflicts on this.

Some universities have gone in the direction of university senate or university council—they call it by different names—which becomes a kind of legislative group representing faculty, students and administrators. And this has been talked about here on two or three occasions, primarily discussions between ASUN and the faculty senate. But it has really not been received very enthusiastically by either group on this campus. The kind of push that exists elsewhere for some reason doesn't seem to exist well here. Maybe it's because we're small enough so that we can keep in touch with each other easier and we know what each segment is doing. Or maybe it's because we've really not had any major conflicts with each other on this sort of thing and therefore felt no need to move into a totally different pattern of representative government. But it really has not struck many sparks of enthusiasm, among many people at least. So right now, I don't know of any movement toward this kind of thing. Las Vegas, interestingly enough, has moved in this direction and now has a senate made up both of students and faculty, and that seems to suit their purposes very well, and that's fine, but I don't hear much about that kind of move here on this campus. What I'm getting at is that I interpret that as a sign, among others, that the system we have seems to be working to the satisfaction of the people involved in it. And maybe that's all we can ask. If it works that well, then—.

ASUN and the senate have had—I don't know if it's active this year or not—have had a kind of joint conference committee of sorts made up of two or three senators—faculty

senators, and two or three ASUN senators. And they have in previous years met together, at least when there're problems of mutual concern, ROTC-type thing. About every two weeks, I have lunch with the president of ASUN, and the chairman of the faculty senate. We're having luncheon Thursday of this week, I think. And that also, you know, it serves the purpose of alerting them to the kinds of things that each group is dealing with, so if there is some overlap of interest or concern, they can work out a way to get together on it or to deal with it separately, but close enough in time so that their reactions will have some meaning to each other.

I think this is an area where it would be a very bad mistake for me to try to impose on the constituents of these groups the pattern of organization they want to follow, and so I've kind of stayed hands off on taking any position for or against a University-wide council or senate or anything of the sort. And I'm satisfied. Maybe one reason I've stayed away is that I'm satisfied this is working well. I do not believe by any stretch of the imagination that this is a kind of sneaky desire on the part of the administration and the Board of Regents to want to divide and conquer, because it serves really just the other kind of way. They tend to reinforce and give added strength, so if there is an action by the faculty senate, and it is concurred in by the ASUN senate and the Academic Council—having three groups, you know, tends to make a stronger case than having a single group speak on a matter. But my feeling is, they should organize the way they want to as long as it's effective and making the voice of the students and faculty heard. And I think it is effective in that.

Maybe it's a very traditional kind of feeling in academic circles, but I have a very strong

feeling about a first rate library. I think it is the heart of a strong academic community, even in areas that do not rely, you know, in a laboratory sense on books, the sciences and engineering and so on, that spend more time in laboratories perhaps than in libraries. Even there, however, the library is a repository of information, knowledge and as a source for keeping up-to-date through serial acquisitions, through special kinds of collections, special services that libraries provide. I can't think of any discipline that ought not at least rely very heavily on a library, and of course, in the social sciences and the humanities, it is a cornerstone of what scholars do, and it should be of what students do.

The library here needs a lot of attention. In some ways, this has not been as big a problem with the legislature as other things. It's somewhat easier to get book money from a legislature than it is to get money for other kinds of operation in the University. And in a couple of legislative sessions, we've really had very fine appropriations for the library; not enough to effect the kind of major catch-up that I think we need, but enough to do a little catching up. But one of the problems that we have is both that we do need to do a lot of catching-up—we've grown so rapidly in the last decade in graduate programs, that our library is really not adequate for the number and spread of graduate programs that we have, so there is a catch-up. In terms of holdings, it's probably about right if we had no graduate programs. But the fact is that we have a lot of graduate programs.

But even when we get reasonably adequate book money, we do not get corresponding operating money to provide the kind of services a library should have, including adequate money to acquire the books that we have money to buy. The problems of

book acquisition and book processing, after they're acquired—these become as expensive as the book itself, and sometimes just don't have money to do this. We deal frequently with a large arrears collection that remains uncataloged. That, by diligent work, is being whittled down now. But it's very difficult.

For example, a very important project is the conversion of the library from the Dewey decimal cataloging system to the Library of Congress system. This change we made about 1966 or '67 upon the recommendation of Dave Heron, who was the librarian then. I pushed hard for this because I know the Library of Congress system is a much more efficient system for users of the library, and it's a lot easier for the library to work with, too. The cataloging system is much more simple than the Dewey system, and so on. So we made this shift, but most of the books that we had at that time still remain uncataloged in the Library of Congress catalog. So we now have the problem of having two collections of books, really, and filed in two different ways, cataloged in two different ways.

At the end of the year, in a typical year, in June, at the end of a fiscal year, typically we end up with some money left over. Departments don't spend all their equipment money or all their operating money, or not all the salary money is spent, so there'll be odds and ends. It's relatively not a large amount. In a twelve million-dollar budget, it might be twenty or thirty thousand dollars. So it's not a big amount for the size of the budget. But every year when we've had this, the major part of it I've given to the library for either book acquisition or for doing some special kind of thing. The money has to be spent quickly and that's the problem. But they've made some catch-up, a little bit, on the reclassification project a couple of times with this, and they've been able every year to buy some additional books.

I think we've had an extraordinarily good library staff, a very hard working staff, and very competent. The three top administrative people that I've worked with there are, I think really exceptional people. Dave Heron was the librarian when I came here, a very quiet unassuming kind of person. But he knew his business and he also knew how to push hard, in his own quiet way, for the needs of his library. He left, I think out of no unhappiness with the University, but because he was just restless. He left for a better librarianship's job at the University of Kansas, a bigger library and more responsibility. Ken Carpenter served as acting director when Dave left, and in my opinion is also an extremely able person, a fine librarian with broad interests and knows a great deal about a lot of things inquiring mind and well-respected by faculty and is accepted as a faculty member (and sometimes librarians are not). And the third person, of course, is the person we appointed as librarian finally, Harold Morehouse, who is I think also—most of the things I've said about the other two, I think would fit in his case, too. They're three different types of people, but they've all been very effective and I think it really maximized to the fullest—together with fine cooperation from their staff. I don't mean to exclude the rest of the staff, because it's a very good staff—maximized the ways of solving the problems that we've had.

The library has also had some pretty good public support. Kind of dormant in the last year or so, the Friends of the Library for a good many years, has been a very active group and has helped raise money for the library and help do a variety of other things. The library was the recipient of a fairly sizable Fleischmann grant about 1963 or '64, before I came here, which I think also indicates a kind of community support. But as a kind of case in point, when we were talking about

the medical library, I think much of what we tried to do with the medical school could have been stymied very easily by an uncooperative librarian or library staff. And on the contrary, Hap [Morehouse] and his staff worked very closely with the medical school in trying to do everything they could with their resources, to get this new venture underway.

The library needs a lot of attention, and it unfortunately is rarely faced with a kind of crisis situation so it kind of just goes along with maybe a kind of a basic adequate support, but not the kind of support that it really should have. But I'm committed to working as hard as I can to get—we're lagging about four or five years behind time in a ten-year plan we did about three years ago. We had hoped for over a million volumes in a ten-year period, but we're not about to reach that. So we're lagging behind what our real needs are.

Do you want to talk about the branch libraries?

I think every one of them was in existence before I came here. I don't think there've been any new ones created since I've been here. And the attitude of both Dave Heron and Hap Morehouse has been basically to keep the ones that are there, but not to expand the branch library concept any further. I know that there's criticism, there's criticism both ways, that there are demands for additional branch libraries. Also there's probably a stronger feeling that we're too small to have any branch libraries. But a kind of feeling of keeping the status quo was what was done again with the medical library. It was made part of another branch library which was already in existence, rather than creating a new one, a new branch library that is. This has never come to me as much of a problem. It may be a bigger problem than I'm aware of in terms of faculty attitudes. I know that

there's discussion about it, and the senate policy committee on the library talks about it every year. But I think the kind of general stance we've taken is, "We'll keep what we've got, but not add any more." I take it back; one new branch library was added since I've been here, and that was the small library we set up at Stead for the Technical Institute. And I think that's the only new one.

The Mines library, I think, is the one that probably gets a specialized kind of use that would justify its separate existence more than the others. It is used fairly heavily by people in the mineral industry, and so maybe that kind of justification for a separate library is stronger there than in the other cases.

Do you ever run into problems of trying to explain the library to the public in talks that you make around the state?

Yes. It's not a topic with a great deal of sex appeal, but if you can get people to listen and to explain why it's important, they understand and they're willing to understand. And that's easier than to deal with some other kinds of problems, like the necessity for an open campus as far as freedom of speech and thought is concerned. That tends to run into closed minds a lot quicker. But if you don't have time—. The kind of feeling that—the story that's perhaps apocryphal, maybe not, of a Nevada state legislator who is reputed to have said, "Why do you need more books? I'll bet nobody up there's read 'em all that you've got now." That kind of attitude, one not expressed that, but, "Why do you need such a big library? Got more books than students, and uh—." You do run across this. But if there's time to talk about a library in terms of what it means to any aspect of the University program, you know, beginning with a freshman English course, and—or just stopping there, they understand.

Would you go into a little bit more detail of the change of directorship from Dave Heron to Harold Morehouse? That change went on for some time.

Well, this is one of the instances where the speculation is probably greater than the facts in the case. The selection did go on a very long time, and it was partly because of the problems in securing good candidates from off-campus. The selection committee, very early in the game, had both Ken Carpenter[s] and Hap Morehouse's name[s] on the list, so they were in the running from the beginning. But they also wanted to look at—and I urged them to look at—candidates from off-campus. Not that I was unhappy with either of these two men who had both been associate directors, in fact was very happy with them, but, you know, maybe it was the time to get a new look at the library with a new leadership, and, although we didn't talk about this, maybe what I was thinking about was perhaps kind of testing our local talent against what was available elsewhere. And there were some problems that were not of our making of getting people interested; I'm not quite sure why, because we never have been that bad off in the library. You know, it's not a disaster area by any means, and libraries generally in the academic community never fare as well as they should. So a professional librarian, I think, is aware of that kind of fact of life, that life is never as good as it should be. But the process did go on a very long time.

The choice between Carpenter and Morehouse was a toss-up as far as I was concerned. I detected—since this is a restricted volume—I detected some kind of uneasiness about Ken Carpenter on the part of some people in the community who had been active in the Friends of the Library group, and that was an element that was important

to us. And I hasten to say, you know, I didn't get a lot of poison-pen letters or phone calls or complaints about Ken; I did not. But it more often was a kind of, "Too bad Dave left," or "What a fine person Hap Morehouse is," kind of damning by not praising in a sense. And I think some of this kind of attitude, although there was no action by the Board of Regents— but I detect fed] this on the part of some members of the Board of Regents.

At any rate, my decision, influenced no doubt by some of these considerations, was to recommend that Hap Morehouse be named librarian. I did discuss with the Board both these men, and some of the reactions about Ken came out in the Board meeting. And that's too bad, because he's not the kind of person that anyone should be unhappy with or angry with or disappointed about or anything else. I think Ken was hurt by this—I think—I'm not sure—by not being appointed. I talked to him several times. He and Hap have always got along very well and the relationship has developed into a very fine one. They've worked together very well as a team. And Hap has recognized Ken's really enormous abilities. In fact, he's a kind of, almost a co-director of the library, and many areas of responsibility are truly Ken's and Hap doesn't look over his shoulder on them.

I think a kind of an attitudinal thing honestly did influence me. I felt bad in a negative way, but not bad because I felt I was picking a second choice, you know, a second-rater, because they both were equally good in my opinion, in different ways. In fact, I think—in many ways Hap has been in many ways a better librarian than Dave Heron, and maybe because he does utilize Ken's strengths more effectively than Dave did. And maybe because he has more skill in the administration kind of thing and with dealing with other administrators and, you know—maybe I'm

just seeing something that Dave didn't have that way.

I hope what comes out of what I've been saying is a very strong personal feeling of great affection and admiration both for all three of these people, because it's truly there. There were just two very strong candidates, and both of them couldn't be directors.

One of the things that on the surface would seem to be easy to plan for is the physical aspects of a campus, the buildings and where they're placed and they're cared for and where trees are planted and this sort of thing. And in some ways it's easier to draw out a master plan for a campus—it's easy to get down on paper, but it has almost as many frustrations built into it as curriculum planning or staffing a university.

The University, about 1962 or '63, before I came here, engaged a planning group, Skidmore, Owens, and Merrill, to master-plan both this campus and the new campus in Las Vegas. And that master plan was officially adopted by the Board of Regents and I think was financed by the legislature and approved by the state planning board, who also approved that master plan. It's kind of, at least, the point of departure now that we still use the gross planning of the campus; that is, where the new buildings go and relationships of buildings. But it's been violated on both campuses more often than it's been adhered to.

As the University changes in its program, these changes get reflected, necessarily in dollars spent on programs and budgeting, but also in the kind of physical plant you build and where things go. A good case in point is the gradual shift of the whole physical education-athletic complex, which originally, when the campus was small, was in the north part of the campus and then found itself

slowly being surrounded by other parts of the campus—other activities like engineering, for example, fine arts. So this involves then, either the continual use of land in the center part of the campus for activities that require a lot of land but not a great deal of intensive use, like a stadium, or the expensive proposition of moving all of that out of an area that is becoming, because of expansion in this case, becoming an academic area. So the decision here was to keep moving north with the athletic and physical education facilities. It's a complex kind of decision and weighing where things should be and the kinds of relationships that various activities have to each other, the most obvious one being that a library should be as centrally located as possible to teaching and research units on the campus. Independent or semi-independent or autonomous units can be more distantly removed. As a case in point, not only athletics but the one Medical School building that we've built, we've also put off on the edge of the campus because it involves a unit that's relatively self-contained. Medical students do not take courses in political science or English; they take course in medicine. So they can all pretty well live by themselves of f on a corner.

Or service units should also occupy a kind of peripheral space. And one of the problems we have on this campus is, as it's grown from the southern part of the campus around the quad, which was the whole operation for several years, the periphery of those days now becomes the central part of the campus, and so we have to keep shifting things. Gradually, what we're trying to do is make the south end of the quad a kind of service unit as the teaching functions move further north. So the building we're in now, formerly a library building, has become an administration building. The Education building (if we skip

the Humanities which is still an anachronism in terms of this kind of move), the Education building has become a Student Services building because it's fairly close to the student union and student housing. It's this kind of conceptual planning that we keep trying to do. But then, if someone offers a building to us and indicates a strong desire for a particular location, we've got a problem, as in the case of the building for the [College of the] State Judiciary, which is an adjunct function of this University and it's not an active teaching unit, but the building was given to us, the program was supported heavily by outside funds, and it's a program we value. So we've kind of compromised; it's north, but very close to the teaching functions of the University.

I guess what I'm saying is that while you can do a master plan, as you can for program development, the big mistake would be to make it static, that you need to keep re-doing it constantly. And planning should be that. It should be in all areas, not something frozen or something embedded in concrete, but something that you keep constantly updating. And I think the important thing is to have some kind of notions about what you're doing rather than just doing it piecemeal. So what I've tried to talk about is a kind of general notion about keeping things together that ought to be together and putting the support kinds of things on the edges.

In recent years, the University has fared very well in new buildings, at about the rate, for about six or seven years, of one new building a year—desperately needed because the problem we have on this campus is the obsolescence of so many of our buildings.

We fare very badly in space utilization studies, because if you count the Mackay School of Mines building and the old Electrical Engineering building, as they are counted, as spaces for teaching and research, then if you

add all these old buildings in, then we've got plenty of space. But they're really, in some cases, literally dangerous buildings and ought not to be occupied. But we have a hard time—because we have these buildings and because we are using them—in justifying new buildings. The only kinds of new buildings that we're able to justify right now, this year, are buildings that are not concerned directly with teaching and research. And that's why our two top priorities are an addition to the library and an addition to the student union building. As badly as we need a humanities building, for example, our space utilization studies will not justify it, and so we're caught up in a kind of frightening situation on this.

The Higher Education Advisory Committee a few years ago did a study of space utilization in buildings on both campuses and recommended that several buildings on our campus should be slated for demolition soon. And what I'm trying to do is to do this, and get 'em down, in particular the old Electrical Engineering building on the quad, and Stewart Hall on the quad. These both will first of all cut out some real aesthetic eyesores, especially Stewart Hall; in the second place will get rid of some dangerous buildings, especially the Electrical Engineering building, and in the third place will help us finally in our justification for space, or for new buildings.

The cluster of buildings in the old Mackay Stadium area—the Social Science building, the Physics and Chemistry building, and the Lecture Hall—I think that is a very attractive group of buildings, and I take no credit, but they've all been designed and built since I've been here and they are a satisfaction to me. I think by and large they're functional buildings; there're problems with them as there is a problem with any new building, but they're attractive from the outside and I think they're pleasant learning situations for

students. And it's certainly a much, better utilization of that space than having a football stadium there!

I think as time goes by, we may have more problems getting buildings on this campus than we've had in the past. Despite space utilization studies and other kinds of things, who gets a building is less subject to the formula determination than who gets faculty, for example. And I think it's quite possible that more and more political-type decisions will be made about the need for buildings on campuses. We saw an example of that with respect to the Board of Regents action about the natatorium at Las Vegas, which was not the recommendation of the administrative staff and was strictly a political decision. And I think we're apt to see more of this kind of thing in the future.

One kind of thing that I've become especially interested in is trying to find, to increase, or to step up the tempo of what this University has been reasonably good at in the past, and that is to get more and more private money into buildings. We've done well by this historically. The Mackay family gave the Mackay Science building and the School of Mines building, the Fleischmann family the College of Agriculture and Home Economics, Fleischmann Foundation the atmospherium, Dr. and Mrs. Orvis a substantial amount for the school of Nursing building. And it seems to me that's the kind of path that we need to pursue. If we can get substantial commitments from individual or foundations or federal government for buildings here, we can keep pace with our needs. If we don't go in that direction, we may fall way back as we did in the '40s and early '50s here. Right now we're just beginning a campaign with the approval of the Board of Regents, to raise private money for an art museum on campus. I hope it goes. I think it will. This would be a teaching

unit for art students as well as a museum in the traditional sense of the word. But I really think we have to spend a lot of energy now in that direction on this campus.

One of the problems on buildings is the complexity of getting a building approved. So many agencies have to become involved in this and it's become even more complex in recent years because of federal government involvement. The general process, before talking about any individual buildings, involves first of all the development of a need for a building, locally, on campus. This needs to be done with a great deal of care and some notion about the function of the building and what goes into it and how it would be used, not an architectural kind of thing, but a use study. Then this is translated into some estimates about square footage and location and a variety of other things by our own staff, our own buildings and grounds staff.

The next problem, once we've established some priorities on this campus, is to get woven into the system priorities. The first ten buildings might represent buildings, these days, from the two universities, the System headquarters, the computing center, the three community colleges, and DRI. All of these might appear on a priority list. And getting on this list in a good spot is a matter of persuading the Board of Regents, first working with other administrators to try to reach agreement, and then trying to get board approval of the most desirable spot you can get on a priority list.

The next problem then, is getting this approved by a state planning board. Generally, they will accept the priorities of the University, but once in a while they will shift them. And then it's a problem of selling this to the governor and to the legislature. This is true even if there are no state monies directly involved, We still need approval to build a

building. The Physical Education building, which is the matter of present concern, does not involve one cent of state funds, it's all being funded out of capital improvement fees paid by students. But as you know from reading the newspapers, it's become a matter of great state concern, and it was a matter of great concern the last session of the legislature about whether or not we would get this building approved, even though no state money went into it. So the complexity of this is built in, in terms of the procedures just for approval. And that does not begin to get involved in the selection of architects, or with the nature of the bidding, and what's happened to construction prices and how this has made bidding so uncertain these days.

Just a couple of instances of some particular problems that have come up about buildings. Two sessions ago—four years ago—the priority list that went to the legislature included a College of Education building for this campus and one for University of Nevada, Las Vegas. This was our first priority on both campuses and we thought it was in the bag, that there'd be no problem with this. But as a sample of the kind of misunderstanding that can arise, I got a call one day while the legislature was in session, from a member of the legislature from Washoe County, who called to say that our building was in trouble, that the senate finance committee was talking as if they were not going to approve it. I went to Carson City right away to talk to people.

The problem, it turned out, was that a good many years ago, the University had talked about and had requested at one point in time a teaching school on the campus, a laboratory school, and some of the members of the legislature who were in the legislature at that time thought that's what we were talking about now. And it was very difficult to convince them that we were not going through

a back door to get a laboratory school. And part of the reason was that the building we were proposing had in it, and does have in it since it's been built, one laboratory teaching situation for pre-school and kindergarten aged children, but it's a laboratory just for that group, involves a playground outside the building. It was the playground and the equipment of this space that caught the eye of some of the legislators. And it was a very difficult job convincing them (and I think a couple of them were never convinced until the building was built) that we really were talking about a classroom building, basically, to teach prospective teachers, not about a laboratory school to be seen in competition with the Washoe School District. That doesn't happen on every building, but I think it's one kind of problem that can arise.

Another problem, the lag sometimes between approval of the building and funding for it can be enormous. When I came here, the Physics building had been approved about two years before I came—maybe in '62 or '63. An architect had been appointed, but no money was made available, and physics, as is true of most areas, changes so rapidly that the plans drawn in '62 would not be appropriate plans for '72. Our attitudes as we watch architects work, about who the architect should be, may very well change during a decade's time also. And in the case of the Physics building, we had some great problems when it began to appear that we finally would get some money, in updating the plans. In working with an architect who would not have been our first choice; a good architect, but chosen for a different building at an earlier period.

This lag sometimes between approval and initial planning, use planning, and the time when you really begin work can present some problems. One of the big problems is the uncertainty in bidding. When I was on a

school board in Ann Arbor, we would build school buildings there—fifteen years ago, we could plan reasonably well what—you know, within limits. We could accept what an architect said about how the bids would come in, within reasonable limits. Costs have gone up so much in construction that architects, best-guessers, or whoever, have great difficulty now in predicting how bids will come in. This has led frequently to delays, as in the case of the physical education complex. The bids have been rejected and we have to start all over again. This is about a four-month delay in redoing some plans in an attempt to get this within [the] budget.

Incidentally, this physical education complex causes another kind of problem concerning the use of the building and what should go into it. The administration recommended a two-phase physical education complex, Phase One to be a teaching facility primarily, physical education part of it, and Phase Two to be sports activities with a gymnasium that would seat four or five thousand people, and so on. After everything had been approved and the architect had done most, or all of his work, a movement began, joined in by some members of the Board of Regents, to change the whole concept and make Phase One not a physical education building, but a sports arena. And this presented really enormous problems, several meetings with two or three regents who wanted to see this change made, with a couple of townspeople including a sportscaster in town who decided that we should have a mini-dome football field instead of a physical education building, and who talked about this in his broadcasts frequently, and who wanted to appear before the state planning board to urge this. We diverted that by having him meet with us. But he did meet with the Board of Regents to

plead the case at the last minute for a mini-dome.

The building as we recommended finally was approved, but— re-approved, I should say—but there often are unpredictable problems of this sort that come up.

I think one thing that deserves comment is first of all, the in-state preference [for] architects and contractors. With respect to contractors, I think it's just an emotional feeling, because if the bid comes in as a low bidder from an out-of-state contractor, unlike the purchasing situation, there is no state provision for equalization for in-state contractors for major construction. But there clearly is a preference for local contractors.

With respect to architects, when I first came here, the decision about an architect was made jointly by—well, first by an administration recommendation, usually of two or three or four architects perhaps in rank order, but a slate of architects and always local. And by local, I don't mean just the state, but I mean from the Reno area. Then the Board of Regents would take this and make their recommendation, either accepting this or modifying it, and pass it on to the state planning board, who finally would make the selection of the architect. As far as I know, or am aware of, there has been no rotation in the selection of architects. David Vhay, for example, has been the architect on two or three buildings since I've been here. He did the Social Science building, the State Judiciary building, and I think one other that—sorry I don't remember, but two or three buildings. Ed Parsons has had the Orvis School of Nursing building and several major renovation or reconstruction kinds of things, but I think that's the only building since I've been here. He renovated the Mackay Science building for the Medical School, for example, and I believe he was the architect on the Fred

Anderson Health Sciences building, so he's had two-plus. Prominent architects in town have had none or only one. Graham Erskine was the architect for the Education building. And I think that's the only one he's had, at least in the time I've been here.

The chief thing in making recommendations on architects has been, as far as I'm concerned, trying to get the kind of aesthetic blend that we want, and if we can get that—. For example, the cluster of buildings in old Mackay Stadium, I think, do fit together well, and there were several architects involved in that group of buildings. In recent years, the state planning board has gone to competition in the selection of architects, and this is true for our Physical Education building, for example. Several architects submitted plans and designs, and then a jury made up of a member of our physical education staff, someone from the state planning board staff, and an outside architect made the decision about which architect. And I think this will probably be the way they will go in the future. They've done this now in several University System buildings.

By and large, our relationship with our architects has been very good. They're different human beings and some are easier to work with than others, but I think the relationship has been good.

You asked about the naming of buildings, and this has been an interesting thing. As far as I know, there never has been any kind of pattern to naming of buildings here. People who gave a building or who were substantial donors in the gift of the building have had the building named after them, and I suppose this is kind of a universal custom. The two Mackay buildings on the campus, for example, the two Fleischmann buildings from the Fleischmann family (Agriculture and Home Economics),

the Orvis School of Nursing building—while not a total gift to the University, a substantial part of the cost of that building was given by Mr. and Mrs. Orvis. And the names have followed there.

Some of the other names have come, I think, from the expectation that there would be funds. As I understand it—it was before I came here—that was the case with the Scrugham Engineering and Mines building, that there was some hope that a bequest would be left to the University that would make that fitting, although I've also been told that, that was an adequate naming anyway, because of Scrugham's activities in the state. The Getchell Library, I think, is the more prominent case in point where high hopes were never materialized, but the name was given to the building. And some of the other buildings were named after either distinguished faculty or former presidents; the Church Fine Arts building after Professor Church, Thompson Education building after Professor [R.C.] Thompson. Presidents have not fared very well in the buildings named after them. This building we're in is Clark Administration building; I think many people think it was named after President [W.E.] Clark; it was not. This building was given to the University by a different Clark family, and it's named after that family. The Clark baseball diamond is named after President Clark.

Hartman Hall, the wooden structure housing ROTC, is named after another president. I think these are the only two named after former presidents.

In these recent buildings that have been built, often the Board of Regents simply named the building as it feels at the time, and while I was not here, I suspect that the Ross Business Administration building was a case in point. It's somewhat unusual at universities to name buildings after people who are still

alive. Si Ross had been a member of the Board of Regents for a great many years. I think he may still have been on the board when this building was named after him; if not, he was fresh off the board.

The Social Science building, the name for that took me by surprise, the Effie Mona Mack Social Science building. It was not a recommendation from the administration, but initiated in the Board of Regents, and was approved by the Board of Regents, without consultation, really, with the administration. Dr. Mack was still alive and was present at the dedication of the building and that sort of thing. I doubt if the departments in the social sciences or the administration would have made that recommendation, and I don't mean that in a derogatory way about Dr. Mack, but at any rate, the departments nor the administration, neither were consulted.

At the time that the Chemistry and Physics buildings and the Education building and the now-in-process Physical Education building either were under way or constructed—I've had recommendations from departments or schools about the names of those buildings, and I have proposed names transmitted to me from the departments. When I did, the Board of Regents didn't reject it, but sent it back and asked that we develop on campus a policy about naming buildings. And we're in the process of doing this now. It's been kind of slow, primarily because I wanted to get some student involvement in this, since the students will be the alumni who see this name perhaps; in this case they're less transient than the faculty, I think. But we will develop some policy to recommend to the Board about naming of buildings, and I think that will be good. It will prevent the naming by individual regent preference or by whim, and I think may establish a way to recognize service to the University. Some of these names I think are

very good, like Palmer Engineering or Church Fine Arts and Thompson Education. If we can get a pattern established that would encourage that kind of naming, I think it would be good.

Right now, many of the new buildings are simply called by function; the Physics building, the Chemistry building, the Education building. And that's the way it'll be until we have a policy, I'm sure.

The two strange naming situations that I've been involved in or've been on the sidelines watching was the Social Science building and the Alfred Higginbotham Department of Journalism, that I think I may have discussed earlier. I think that about exhausts my comments about the naming of buildings.

One of the frustrations, in a way, that I've felt in the seven or eight years I've been here is the kind of difference in attitude toward Las Vegas and this campus with respect to the building program. Half of it is understandable; that is, Las Vegas had no campus and obviously needed buildings in order to carry on a program. And that got a lot of attention as it should have, but in the process somehow, the problems of having an older campus were really ignored. And the problems of maintenance of buildings on this campus is so much more considerable than it is on a new campus, and we were expected, and still are expected, to apply about the same kind of cost-per-square-foot in this—or whatever measure is used—in the maintenance of the buildings, as Las Vegas applies. But we have some very old buildings in very bad condition that we're still using heavily, and we simply have not had funds. And that's the other half of it, that we haven't been given, in my opinion, the attention necessary to keep our physical plant up to, really in some cases, to adequate safety standards. So in the process of doing so much

for new buildings at Las Vegas, we've been left out with respect to the problems of keeping an old campus really habitable and usable.

We've done reasonably well about getting new buildings, but this other part of it is of major concern. We just cannot, for example, get twenty-five to fifty thousand dollars to replace steps on the Library building, and that seems like an absurdly simple kind of thing, but the Board of Regents, given a choice between a new swimming pool at Las Vegas and repairing steps (and other projects I hasten to say) on this campus, it was a new swimming pool that came into existence. We're using a couple of buildings that have been condemned and one of them will be locked up in January, until we can afford to tear it down. We don't even have money for demolition of the building.

The buildings on the quad, with the exception of the new one, the relatively new one, the Ross Business Administration building, every one of them needs major attention, starting with Morrill Hall and moving around the quad. But it's just not the kind of thing that has appeal; to talk about replacing steps or plaster that falls from a ceiling, is not as glamorous as talking about students who have no place at all for classes or faculty who have no office space or whatever. And I've really been at a loss about how to solve this. Every chance I get, we grab legislators and regents by the collar and show them obvious things, like the decaying steps in front of the library. And they sympathize with us, but [laughs] that's about as far as it goes. The only thing I can think of now is just to lock up buildings that are dangerous (as some of them are) and refuse to let people go in it. I may get into some problems with this, but I also don't want to see a building collapse in a mild earthquake—and it could happen in a couple of these buildings—and somebody

get seriously hurt or killed. And I don't want to get attention to our problem that way, you know; I'd rather do it some other way.

Buildings and grounds suffers year after year in terms of financing, anyway. It's always the easiest place to borrow money from or to take money from. There's some logic to it in a way, that about seventy-five percent of our budget is "people" money, to pay salaries. And that should be the first commitment we have, but if that seventy-five percent needed isn't there in dollars, we get it, typically, from money that should go into remodeling projects or painting projects or other buildings-and-grounds kinds of things. So they suffer first, always, and suffer hardest. And our campus, in my opinion, still is a beautiful campus. I think that under the kinds of conditions we've had to live with, it's been maintained well. But there are very clear signs that it's going downhill, and if we aren't able to do something about this in the next year or two, this is going to look like a messy place, and it will be a messy place.

If you have any good thoughts about how [laughs] to get attention to the problem, including internally—you know, I'm as guilty as anyone of taking money from buildings and grounds when we have other needs. But it's getting to be a very serious problem.

Morrill Hall, by any logical standard, ought not to be there at all. But like the first building on any college campus, it's still there. It's become a sentimental object and we have such a small bit of a sense of history at the University that I'm delighted to see it stand. Parenthetically, this University really has less consciousness of its history, I think, than any I've ever been associated with. There really aren't very many traditions about the University or the great names of the past in football, or the great presidents of the past, or whatever. They were there, but, you know,

we haven't retired jerseys and done the kinds of things that other universities have. There really is no school song, you know. We have no symbols of our own, even use the state seal at the University seal. And so Morrill Hall is about all we've got in a tangible way of our history, and I share the feeling that, let's hold onto it if we can. The alumni have taken a great interest in this, and indeed have raised some money—not very much yet, but I think they will during the centennial year, raise enough money for restoration of that into an alumni center. And that will be great if they can raise the quarter of a million dollars it will take to do this. The building cost \$12,500 to build—originally—[laughs] and our best estimate is that it will take a quarter of a million dollars to restore it in any reasonable way.

It is a very attractive campus, basically, and I hope we can keep it that way. We [have] been talking about buildings, but we need a lot of attention to grounds too, and it's about all we can do to keep the grass mowed and the leaves raked up. But we need some imagination and new plantings and other ways of beautifying the campus that we just don't have funds for. And that really is the heart of it; not a lack of desire.

I guess that's about all I have to say on this.

Talking about traditions, the lakeing for crossing the quad is one that left me cold, not because of the quad, but because of the lakeing feature. It's a dangerous kind of thing, as we found at the last Mackay Day when two or three students were hurt badly being tossed in the lake. But the protection of the quad, I think, is something that really does disturb me, and it will be just a maze of pathways very soon if we can't find some way mostly to keep them off, and to keep the touch-football games off, and the things that are really injurious to the turf. That still is in a way

the heart of the campus and it's certainly the heart of the traditional campus, and I think a beautiful place. We're trying hard to do things to keep it that way. The trees that line the quad, for example, are on the verge of dying of old age, and they're beautiful, but they're sick. So we're trying, we are planning to replace the trees on a gradual basis with some pin oak trees that will have almost an indefinite life, a two or three hundred-year life, unlike the elms. We hope to start planting this winter even, or early spring, interspersing between the present trees new oak trees, maybe twenty or twenty-five feet tall, keep the elms for five or six years but trim them back so the oaks can get light, and eventually remove the elms, and when the oaks are big enough, to give a nice appearance to the quad.

Maybe I mentioned this earlier, but one of the things that I'm happiest about—minor things—is the commencement on the quad. I came here in the summertime and that was so beautiful; it really was. That and the lake, I think, are two very nice things about this campus. And I began talking right away about, why don't we have commencement out in the open? With the kind of climate, generally, that late spring or early summer has here, the gamble is a good one. It took an awful lot of arm-twisting and persuading, oddly enough, and I think Jack Shirley, who runs commencement, all the mechanics of it, still is very unhappy about not having it in the gym or in the Coliseum—I think largely because he's fearful of the weather and the inconvenience of having to change at the last minute, which someday we'll have to do, I'm sure, but we haven't yet. But I think it's just the perfect spot for University commencement, and I'm willing to gamble year after year that the rains don't fall.

But we do need to find some way to protect that quad. Otherwise we might as well

asphalt it, park cars on it. And you know how I feel about that.

Incidentally, parking is another major problem with respect to use of facilities. We waste an awful lot of very good space on this campus by providing the kind of convenience parking that we do. We really should get the parking off on the edges of the campus. We could do a lot of great things on the campus then, instead of having every twenty-five by thirty-yard area asphalted and blocked for six or seven cars. We started a parking permit fee a few years ago, and it's very modest, but the reason we did this was to begin to accumulate enough money to build a couple of parking structures on the edge of the campus. And we will do this (if I'm around here [laughs] at any rate) and stack cars in parking structures. When I mention this to faculty, some of them get apoplectic about it, because they like the convenience parking. And you know, it's great for me personally. I walk ten feet out from the building and there's my car. But I'll be the first one to move my car into one of these parking structures if we get one of them, whatever the inconvenience. I think what will happen is that we'll have howls about it at first, but the convenience of having your car protected from the sun and the snow and the rain will outweigh the inconvenience of having to walk a hundred yards or two hundred yards from your automobile to your office. But there are a surprising number of faculty who feel that an important fringe benefit now is being able to park ten yards from the building you work in. That's gotta go! [Laughs] There's just no two ways about it. It's unsightly, and it's an enormously wasteful way to handle land. We should have a large open parking area where we have large crowds, but even that eventually—I think we can put a structure up that will handle most of the crowds up by the stadium. But for everyday parking, the beauty

of this campus is really marred by the parking lots scattered all over the place.

Even before we get those, an immediate goal I have is to get rid of Stewart Hall, that unfortunate half-building right at the [south] end of the campus, and the parking that's around it—move the parking someplace else. Because the first view a visitor gets of this campus as he drives off Ninth Street into this main entrance into the campus is this sawed-off building and a lot of automobiles. The campus is just more beautiful, and deserves better than that first view. It's a weird kind of an introduction to the campus that otherwise is an attractive campus. I hope we can get rid of Stewart Hall this year, even. I think we will, too, and get some greenery in there, even if we have to keep the little parking lot, if we can block it out (shrubbery or trees) from sight, you know.

Did I talk at all about the problem of group recognition when I first came here? Well, I'm not sure it belongs as a crisis thing, although it was, for that day, an important thing; it took a lot of time.

In the first full year I was here, there was an *ad hoc* Committee to Stop the War in Vietnam on campus. And the rules and regulations about things like that were so much more rigid then than they are now, that one of the rules that we had (and it may still be on the books, I suspect that it is, 'cause it's not a bad rule), is that non-recognized groups cannot indiscriminately use University facilities. The ASUN had been, up to that point, the prime official recognizer of groups, and groups tended to fall neatly into nice categories. They were either faculty groups, like AAUP, or they were student groups, like fraternities, sororities, clubs and so on. But this one was a group of undergraduates, graduates, faculty members—small group,

because it wasn't a very popular cause in 1965-1966. The sentiment was so totally the other way that it was a kind of a holy war in those days.

But they had the problem then of getting recognition in order to have meeting space on campus, where they wanted to meet. ASUN wouldn't touch it because it wasn't strictly an undergraduate group. So I gave them kind of interim recognition while we worked out some procedure for handling groups of this sort, thinking that there may be others that might come along on this kind of basis. I met with that group and or representatives of that group, with the chairman of the University Council (the forerunner of the Faculty Senate), the president of ASUN, and the president of the brand new Graduate Student Association, I guess half a dozen times, hammering out a procedure and a set of criteria for measuring suitability for recognition of groups of this sort. It's all kind of tepid now, and doesn't seem like much, but at the time, it was a highly controversial thing. Members of the Board of Regents were greatly concerned about having "subversive" groups like this meet on campus, and newspapers covered this kind of thing, rather extensively. So it was the kind of thing that was getting a lot of attention.

But we did work out some recognition procedures. We'd set up a permanent committee, made up of a faculty member appointed by me, a representative of the Graduate Student Association, appointed by the Graduate Student Association, and ex officio, the vice president for activities of the ASUN, whoever that was. With the chairmanship rotating every year, it was a very complex kind of thing. The committee actually still exists, and has this year recognized two groups, but it's all kind of *pro forma* now. The controversial part of it was what led to it, though.

My first contact with regent concern about faculty attitudes on social and political matters was on that issue at that time. Through no kind of formal action or anything, but just informal comments from individual members about people like Erling Skorpen, a most honest, fine human being, but who is in his honesty, outspoken on something like this, several regents expressed concern about, was he the proper kind of faculty member to have? A kind of introduction to me of that kind of conservative concern about non-University related matters, really. And this strictly was that.

Well, I mention [that] in passing, not as a crisis thing, although it was a very significant thing at the time. If I can kind of skip around, some other things that created some concern.

One thing with. respect to Governor's Day, and I think.. I've talked enough about it in other contexts than here—. One thing I think that I did not include in the other statement, and as a matter of fact I don't think I've included it anyplace, except here for the first time, but, immediately after Governor's Day, a day or two after, Governor [Paul] Laxalt left the country. No cause-effect, but he had been scheduled for a European trip. You may remember he went to the Basque country, and so on. Things were still quite tense, of course, that week, with the Board of Regents meeting that weekend. Sometime between Governor's Day and the Board of Regents' meeting, I got a phone call from Lieutenant Governor [Ed] Fike who said, "I know how terrible things are on the campus, and how serious they are, and I just want you to know that I'm ready to call up the National Guard anytime you tell me to." So help me!

You can see why I've never said anything about it. I assured him that things were not *nearly* that bad, and that there was no

point even of considering that, and I would appreciate it if he would not say anything to anyone like this, because it could inflame a situation that wasn't bad but could be. He understood. I've seen him many times since then; we've never referred to that phone call, and I hope we never do. But obviously he had been watching television and reading newspapers about other campuses too much.

One other kind of interesting aftermath I'm not sure I have commented on, when I got ready to go to the regents' meeting, or during that week, I debated seriously about whether I should leave the campus and go to Elko for the regents' meeting, because things were still quite tense, and two major rallies were already scheduled. One was a candle light ceremony at dusk in honor of the Kent State students who had been killed. And the other was scheduled by some mediating students and faculty, a kind of "let's get it together" session, the cowboys and the liberals and the longhairs could meet together. Both these were scheduled for the Bowl, and both we anticipated to be quite large in size. I had called a meeting of all the deans on the campus, and met with them in this office for about an hour or an hour and a half, and raised with them the question about, in their opinion, should I go to Elko or should I stay here in the event that something got out of hand, especially in these two meetings? And we talked about this at some length. I was really quite impressed with the kind of discussion that they led on this. After listening to them, I told them that it seemed to me that with their cooperation and the cooperation of others—. I had already discussed at some length with Gary Peltier, who was chairman of the faculty senate—I think probably was present at the meeting with the deans—and with Frankie Sue Del Papa, the ASUN president, this kind of dilemma. I decided after talking to all

these people to go on to Elko, that I thought this would be, of the two choices, the least provocative in a way, you know. And I did feel that with all the good will that everybody had, on all sides, nobody was out trying to make trouble. I was really convinced of that. I really felt, finally, that nothing untoward would happen insofar as anybody in any kind of leadership position had any control over. The one thing that bothered me was the possibility of the roaming non-students—and we've not had much experience with them, but we've had a few who came to the campus during those days—who seemed to seek out trouble spots and sometimes try to inflame them. And that was really the only thing, the only variable over which we didn't have much control, and which might have happened.

So I went on to Elko, but I did take the precaution of chartering an airplane and having it on the standby in Elko in the event something happened here, so I could be here within an hour, an hour and a half. And obviously, I didn't have to use it, but it was well worth the hundred dollars or so that it cost to have an airplane on standby basis. I think one of the things was that I prayed very hard I wouldn't have to use the airplane because I don't like to fly even in a monster jet, [laughs] and the prospect of flying back in a Piper Cub was something that left me very cold [laughs]. It was a tense enough time so that, while I thought I should go, I also thought I should be prepared to come back in the event something happened.

The two meetings, incidentally, went beautifully, by all accounts I had. They really were great, and they justified the kind of faith that a lot of people have in the students on this campus. In a crisis situation, even if, in my opinion, some of them had not behaved in appropriate ways before, they certainly did in pulling it all together, which was great.

I don't think there's anything else about Governor's Day that I haven't said so many times—.

When you were talking about the peace movement, you didn't mention Bill Scott, who was also active.

There were [William T.] Bill Scott* and Erling, and there may have been one or two other faculty members who were active. But Erling was the chief one. I heard comments about Bill, as a matter of fact. The first time I'd met Bill was in connection with problems of recognition, this sort of thing in this group. But Erling was a much more eloquent spokesman for a group like this, and the press sought him out more frequently than they did Bill. I don't know whether he made himself available or what, but he was more often quoted. And he was a very popular teacher, and had a lot of students and big classes, so, you know, word about Dr. Skorpen was—he's better known, really, than Bill Scott. There were some others, and some students, too, whose names were called to my attention. [Skorpen] by no means was dismissed or pushed out or threatened of anything of the sort. But, there was so much talk, I'm sure this was a contributor to his leaving. He left of his own free will and went to the University of Maine. President Armstrong and I both publicly defended him on several occasions, and privately quite frequently. But I'm sure this was part of his reason for leaving. Maybe he was just dramatic about the whole thing, I don't know.

Maybe another one that I found personally [a] very traumatic kind of thing was in the same spring as Governor's Day, the spring of 1970. *Series* is too much of a word— but the two big confrontation meetings in the Union, with three or four hundred students

at each of them (I don't think I've talked about these, have I?)—. This Black Student Union had been trying to get some positive things started, and I think that was either the first or second year of their having a Black Week, and they had invited as a speaker a man named Harry Edwards, a sociologist from the University of California at Berkeley. He came in on a Wednesday, and I know it was a Wednesday because the ASUN senate met that night, and part of the plan was that he was to speak to the senate. I had a schedule jammed up all day, but I told Tex Barrett and Jesse Sattwhite, who were either legally or in fact the leaders right then of the BSU, to bring him by and let me meet him. So, they came in the office, and Mrs. Baldwin came in to tell me that they were out in the outer office, and so I went out and chatted with him for a few minutes. I had a group of people in here for a meeting, and came back in the office. One of the students had asked me earlier, and then asked me in his presence if I was going to be able to come to the Senate meeting that night and hear him speak, and I had said no, that I wouldn't be able to, I had other plans for the evening, including dinner. The plans for the evening were strictly personal. (And I don't want to get involved in a long medical history problem, but my wife, for three or four years, has been having occasional problems with enormous headaches that are accompanied with things that frighten me, at least, like numbness in the right arm and leg, and oh, we've been through a lot of tests and things at Stanford and elsewhere, and still not quite sure what this is, but the night before she'd had

*Scott was organizer and leader of the Northern Nevada Peace Center, Skorpen an independent spokesman for the peace movement.

one of these things, and I just wanted to be home with her, and be sure she was all right. Otherwise I would have gone to the meeting. So I went home, and she was feeling fine, so I came back.)

I went to the Travis Lounge to stick my head in and the place was jammed. And there was Harry Edwards, the most demagogic kind of demagogue I ever heard in my life, and I recognize that I'm saying this with a lot of prejudice because his attack was aimed very personally at me, but nonetheless I still viewed it as demagoguery. He was talking when I came in and he was saying something to the effect that, "...and when they took me to see him, all he'd do was come out and shake my hands and leave. He wouldn't even talk to me. And he said he wasn't coming to the meeting tonight, he'd rather fill his belly with food someplace than come here and get some food for thought." And that kind of thing, on and on.

And finally Dave Slemmons, who was a member of the senate then stood up and said—you know, by then I was standing in the doorway, the place was crowded. But, you know, all the students had turned around seen us standing there and listening to all this. Dave interrupted him and said, "President Miller's here in the room. He did come after all. And how about giving him a chance to tell his side to it."

And Edwards raised his hand [gesture] and said, "No," he said, "If you do that," he said, "that won't be fair, because you can't believe a word he says."

And Dave got up and walked out. Dave and Peter Reams, who was ASUN vice president then, got up and left also, and said they were full up to here with that. The rest of them sat there and took it. And this hurt me. I must confess that no one except these two students would at least give me the

opportunity to say anything. So I stood there and heard the rest of his speech and then left when they turned to other things.

What followed even before I left and after I left became even more intense—was a real black-white kind of confrontation right there, with apparently from the accounts I had, with Edwards kind of egging on the blacks; you know, "Why haven't certain kinds of specific things been done for you?" And, "Why aren't you getting more money so you can really put on a Black History Week?" And you know, this kind of thing. And particularly, apparently, the attack against me for not showing any interest in black students.

So, ASUN and the Black Student Union agree (and it was a very tense situation, I gather almost physical) they would have a series of rap sessions, and the first one, at least, they would invite me to be a principal participant in this. So they had two of these, and then I refused to do with anything more about it.

The first one in the lounge of the Union was—again the Union was just jammed full. And we had a kind of question-answer forum kind of thing with administrators seated in a circle in the middle of the room with questions prepared by small groups and directed to the administrative groups sitting in the middle of the room. This was designed to keep tensions down, to keep people from shouting at each other. Everything had to be kind of semi-prepared. And it went on for a couple of hours, and it was a very traumatic kind of thing, and I think I did mention with respect to Dean Peterson, who was involved in this, and who got in a big argument about a question of fact with Charlie Ross, the chairman of the art department, and I think it was a major factor in Glen Peterson's resigning as dean—it was—you know—it was just that kind of thing.

It was totally inconclusive, you know. Nobody was satisfied with anything, except that everyone felt he had a big audience then to make whatever kinds of rhetorical points he wished to make, maybe including me [laughs], you know. So they decided that, okay, they would follow this one up. The notion was that the issues had been brought out in this session, so they'd have another meeting to determine what to do now that the issues were clearly defined. I never have discovered what the issues were, you know; they weren't clearly defined to me, but nonetheless, they had a second meeting, this time, because the crowd was so large, in the dining commons.

And it was jammed to the gills again. And this one was even worse, you know. It didn't even have the structure of the first one. They were really kind of shouting matches. Three or four of us—two or three people in the office of Student Affairs, I think, Mike Laine may have been acting dean of men then, was one of them, Sam Basta, I think—I'm not sure that Sam was at that second meeting. A lot of people didn't come, but there were some of the academic deans, but not many were there. And then around each of these people, enormous mobs of students, shouting at each other and at the administrator. A totally fruitless kind of thing, and something that could very easily have got physically out of hand.

There's really not much point to this, because, you know, nothing really happened, but they were very emotional kinds of confrontations and the sort of thing that I found very distasteful because I could see no way in either session for anything to be accomplished except a forum for the fine rhetoric of impassioned pleas, with no one really listening. And it's no way, in my opinion, to get things done. After the second one, I said at that meeting that I would have

no more part of this kind of thing, that I'd meet with anybody anytime, in small enough groups to carry on dialogue, questions, answers, discussions, but not in massive outpourings of emotion like that. So there's no real end to the story, except one little interesting bit of irony. Roger Heyns, who's a close, long-time personal friend of mine, was chancellor at the University of California at Berkeley at that time, is now president of the American Council on Education, and we had been friends in Ann Arbor, graduate students together, and our families had grown up together and that sort of thing. We saw a great deal of each other in Ann Arbor, but interestingly enough, when we were this close, we rarely saw each other, and if we did, kind of in passing. But I had dinner with him this fall in Washington, and I told him this story about this member of his faculty who single-handedly got—in my opinion, at least—got a whole campus roiled up, and I think he did. I think, you know, I think it was part of the thing, but by no means a major thing, but it was part of the Governor's Day problem day, too. I think, you know, it was a kind of unease which he helped stimulate. It was a contributing thing.

And I told him this story, and I also told him another thing. About three or four days after this, I had a meeting in Salt Lake City. And one of the people in the session was the vice president of the University of Utah, who got called out of his meeting, the meeting we were in, and was gone for half a day, and he came back that evening for an evening meeting, and he said, "I'm sorry, but we just had a real mess on the campus. The Black Student Union invited in a man named Harry Edwards [laughs] to speak and the place is all in turmoil." And so, you know, Harry was spreading this poison across the country. Well, anyway, I told this story to Roger Heyns,

and he said, “You know,” that, “maybe there’s hope after all in what we’re doing, because I’ll send you a copy of the commencement address that Harry Edwards made to the graduating class in sociology at Berkeley this past spring.” And he did and I read it with great unbelief. The most sensible, sane preachment about the necessity for working within the establishment, and that that’s the only effective way for blacks or any other minority to really accomplish anything—and you know, that approach. Very low-keyed, very sensible. So you know, people do change, I guess. Maybe that’s what education’s all about.

This might have been kind of symbolic of what was going on all across the country, too.

Sure, and I’m sure that our students were waiting for a spark to set this off, and he happened to come, and he knew what he was doing, I’m sure, and was getting the kind of response that he felt must be very gratifying to him. It gave our students the occasion for being part of the mainstream kind of thing.

But that, I think, was a traumatic thing—I think the one thing that hurt was the student reaction to his speech, with—you know—he was a spellbinder, he was very effective, very good, too good, [laughs] as a matter of fact. But with the two or three exceptions that I mentioned, and maybe a couple of others, but no mass movement, there was no inclination to hear more than him. And because *he* said it would be unfair, that whatever *I* said would be prejudiced, you know. It’s interesting how people react, get caught up—and you understand very well that I’m presenting my side of something that affected me strongly, too.

Another kind of problem that persisted until about three or four months ago, was

the whole constant set of problems centering around Jesse Sattwhite. They rarely got to a major crisis kind of state, but they were always a kind of a constant irritant. It stopped three or four months ago only because he left for Washington and is no longer here. Jesse was one of the black athletes, recruited unwisely in my opinion, a great big hulking fine linesman, and very good at that, when he practiced and when he kept in shape, but he didn’t always do that either, you know. But when he was in shape, he was a good football player. He in my opinion, was really not a very bright person. But because he had received a lot of attention, a lot of publicity, became a kind of very important symbol to many of the black students on the campus, who kept many times thrusting him forward into a leadership position, or letting him say their thing for them. You know, they’d put the words to him and he didn’t mind pounding on my desk (which he did frequently) or anyone else’s.

I think my first contact with Jesse was when the football team played at Hawaii. Nena and I went with the team to see the game and combine it with a little vacation of our own. And we rode with the team. I ever since told Nena that, it’s not Jesse, that she’s the one who’s responsible for all the problems with Jesse. We sat on the plane right in front of Jesse. As soon as the plane was off the ground (and this was typical of Jesse), he complained because he was seated—players on the team treated him like a big kid, you know, in a way, and so they gave him a good seat, right by the window, so he could see the ocean and all that sort of thing. But he began complaining that his seat wasn’t as wide or as big as the seat across the aisle in the plane. So whoever was sitting over there said, “Come on, Jesse, I’ll trade with you.” So Jesse went over there and sat for a while, and then decided that something was wrong with that seat, and so he

moved back again eventually to the seat right behind us. So Nena felt kinda sorry for him, you know, and turned around and talked to him almost all the way to Hawaii. They carried on quite a conversation. They were real close friends; still are, you know. He thinks she's just the greatest thing that ever lived.

But even then, he had kind of mixed up feelings about his role. He really was not well accepted by the team. They treated him, as I say, like a big kid, but he was really never part of them. And he knew that. For example, one of the players hurt his ankle in the game, and instead of spending the weekend enjoying Hawaii, as the rest of the team did, that kid came back and Jesse volunteered to come back with him. You know, he wasn't having fun with this group. Dr. [Louis] Lombardi, who was acting as team physician in those days, used to say that he always had troubles with Jesse because if he gave a shot of something to a white player, Jesse would say, "Okay Doc, if you give one to the white boy, you gotta give me one." But then Jesse didn't like the needle, so he did get kinda mixed up [laughing] about, you know, whether he should get the shot or not.

At any rate, Jesse first came to kind of public attention by apparently—and the reason I have to qualify is because I don't know, I wasn't there and the subsequent hearings on this were inconclusive—but apparently threatening Dr. Robert McQueen, I believe about a scholarship that he thought he was entitled to but didn't get.

Bob McQueen came to see me about it, and I told him that if he would file formal charges of some sort (we didn't have a code of conduct then, but there were ways to get at this), that I would be happy to follow through on it. Or if he really were threatened, if he chose to take it to the Reno police, which would be an appropriate other alternative kind of action,

fine. Bob didn't want to do that, though. He didn't want to sign a complaint because, I understood him to say, he was afraid that if he did, then Jesse might then seek out his family to take it out on them. Well, I let it drop there, because I really do have strong feelings that if a person wants to make a complaint, you know, or has something to say, he should be willing to be counted about it, and not then hide behind it anonymously. And if Bob didn't choose to file a formal complaint, then that was his decision, I thought.

The next thing I heard about this was a very angry phone call from Neil Humphrey, who said whether I liked it or not, he was going to start proceedings against Jesse Sattwhite because Bob McQueen had complained. I tried to tell Neil my reasons for not following through, but that didn't satisfy Neil, who sometimes gets carried away about things like this, too. So a big hearing was scheduled about whether or not Jesse had threatened Bob McQueen. Bob finally, I believe, wrote a statement, but would not appear at the hearing. And the hearing was really kind of inconclusive about who did what, and Jesse ended up with probation for a semester or year. The hearing was held before the Student Judicial Council, but it became a big—it was the first of our big public hearings. It was held in the lounge of the Union. And then this was appealed somehow to the Board of Regents, and there was a hearing before the Board of Regents involving Jesse. This time [was] I think, the first time Charlie Springer entered into a case of this sort, as far as the University is concerned, as an attorney for him.

It all was kind of inconclusive. It ended up with Jesse being on probation and he from that time on was perpetually on probation for one thing or another. He apparently did this kind of thing. If a grade didn't satisfy him, he would either threaten or come so close to

threatening, you know, maybe not quite; you couldn't quite pin him down this, but kind of veiled threats. He was a troublemaker on the campus to a lot of people. And he was being used, very much, in my opinion, by the other blacks on the campus. Because he was a kind of fearless type, and he wouldn't mind saying what some of them would not want to say themselves. He's been in this office uncounted times, with groups of students or by himself, and alternately angry and on other occasions to come by as a dear friend. And he was clearly sincere in both capacities. He never threatened me, and I told him one time, that he'd better not ever, and I tremble when I think about it. Suppose he had; what would I do with that big hulking three-hundred-pound, six-foot-five character? He told me one time when he was in the office, he said, "I used to call you the good Dr. Miller, but I'm not gonna do that any more. I'm just gonna call you Dr. Miller," and, you know, that kind of conversation with him—he was very angry that day and he also was smart enough to know when he had a good audience, and he would play to his audience.

Not *the* last time, but one of the times last summer, he came in the office—he married a very bright, attractive girl—black girl—who was a good solid B-plus student on her own, she didn't need to threaten anyone; she did this by herself. And they had a little baby who was, I guess, about a year and a half old. They brought him in frequently just to see me, and Jesse frequently would just stop by and say hello. But he was in to raise hell with me about something, and he brought Jackie with him, his wife, and the baby. I sat where I'm sitting [at the conference table] and they sat across from me, and Jackie was holding the baby, and one of them had given the baby some keys on a ring to play with. And the baby was having the time of his life [laughs] banging the keys

on the table and laughing and grinning. And it just infuriated Jesse and he kept yelling at the baby and at Jackie. He grabbed the keys away from the baby—big thing. It was very important to him, when he was with Jackie, he nearly always was belligerent because he felt very strongly the necessity for asserting himself as the male in the family. And she rarely said anything when he was there. She would also come by to see me and talk, but she'd talk then, but not when he was there.

And as they left that day, he got them out of the office, and the last thing he said to me while they were here was, "It's the last time you'll ever see me. I'm never coming back. I think you've betrayed all of us." Something like that.

He got them out of the office and I went back to my desk, and then he came back in and closed the door. And I got up and I said, "What can I do for you Jesse?"

And he said, stuck out his hand and he said, "I just wanted to thank you," he said, "I know you know very well that I could never have made it through here if you hadn't been behind and helping me, and I'll always be grateful [laughing] to you for all your help," and on and on, soon as he got [away from] his audience [laughing].

But Jesse remained a kind of a constant irritant, and a very prominent one, and was involved in almost every escapade of whatever magnitude that the BSU was involved in, or parts of it were involved in, during this time. He was one of the students, or non-students by then, but he was one of the people arrested in the takeover of the office, you know. He was always in these things. There really is no climax to this story, either, except that he's a problem I've had, and continue to have, with some members of the Board of Regents and with the chancellor of the System, who I think has felt thwarted because nothing really big

ever happened to Jesse. He was never thrown out on his ear, or, you know, nothing decisive really ever happened.

Much of the criticism I've had about the Bob Davis scholarship, for example, from some regents, has centered around the fact that while Jesse didn't qualify for it (he was not a Nevadan), Jackie was a Nevadan, did qualify, and quite legitimately; she met all the criteria, got scholarship money. And that was too much for some of the regents to take. You know, it's one reason why Mel Steninger has asked about every two or three months, for a report on the Bob Davis scholarship money. And it's one of the reasons why I've had as many as three or four letters from Neil Humphrey outlining the research he's done— or had done for him—about how many dollars of various kinds that the two Sattwhites have got from the University through loan programs, scholarships, grant-in-aids, so on. Last one I had of these was last spring sometime from Neil, and I was irritated, too, after three or four notes like this. So I asked Dick Dankworth to take two or three, I don't care how many—and he did take two or three—black athletes, real people, who were here through a degree—four years, and compile how much money they actually got and how much they were eligible to get. And as it turned out, Jesse got just about the same as a couple of totally uncontroversial black athletes. He got totally, something like two or three thousand dollars less than he was eligible for, even though the total amount for the two of them was something in the neighborhood of maybe fifteen to twenty thousand dollars overall, much of it federal money over which we just administered. But you know it was this kind of constant harassment from others that I kept getting about Jesse. But he graduated, and Jackie

graduated, and they moved to Washington this year.

Again, it's not a crisis situation, but it's been something to cope with, as far as I'm concerned, partly with Jesse, but mostly about the reaction to Jesse, and it was an overreaction, I think; that kind of overreaction would do nothing but spur him on.

There aren't very many students that you have that close and continuing relationship with, are there?

No, I think he would be kind of in a class by himself. And that one is kind of unique, because it was a combination of my being irritated at him half the time and his being irritated at me half the time, and yet I like him, and I think he liked me, and you know, we got along all right too. I don't feel as close to him as I do in terms of friendship kind of thing as I do to a lot of students that I've known well while they were students, and some of them that I still see now that they have graduated and [are] doing other things but it certainly was a unique kind of relationship.

He kept asking me what my first name was, what that N stood for, because he was going to name his second child after me, if he just knew what that was. And I wouldn't tell him, 'cause I told him, better let Jackie pick the name of the next [laughs] child and not name it after me. And besides, I told him one time, "If you name that child after me, you'd change its name so many times: every time you got mad at me, Jesse, you'd want to change its name." I kind of miss him [laughs].

I think I have mentioned earlier, that it's not just the blacks, but there are a lot of students, and a lot of human beings who— maybe it's true of all of us— that react in totally different ways depending on the nature of the audience present. You know, maybe all

of us do that. Jesse was a clear case in point. But I think all of us probably do that. We want to look good in the eyes of whoever we feel is important at that time. I think I did mention on one of the tapes, about two hundred tapes back, the occasion—I guess when Jesse had been charged, before the hearing after he'd received formal charges, and the announcement about when the hearing would be held and so on—a whole group of students came into my office one day, about thirty of them I guess, unannounced—very angry. And Jesse was with them, and they lined up in front of my desk.

Dave Phoenix was a teaching fellow in the English department, graduate student here. Had been an undergraduate here, and I'd known him slightly all his college career. In the years that ASUN published literary kind of things, he was, I think one year an editor of one of the literary kinds of things and at least was a frequent contributor over the three or four year period to these things. At the end of the fall semester, '69-'70, a student in one of his classes, had taken home with her a dittoed copy of a poem that Dave had written and passed out to his class. Maybe I should put the word poem in quotation marks, but it was a poetic type endeavor, in format at least. And her father had found this, and had asked her where she got it. And she said her English teacher had written it and handed it out to the class as a sample of creative writing. Well, it didn't have much literary merit, and it was very modern in style, with a good deal of the James Joyce stream of consciousness kind of modern writing. But it also had several four-letter words, and some—I suppose, because it was confusing to read—at least semi-explicit sexual references in it. As several members of the English faculty told me, the most offensive thing about it was it was bad poetry, you know,

and that really was kind of my impression, too. It wasn't that obscene kind of thing, but it did have four-letter words in it, and it had some phrases that I gather were intended to be sexual kinds of references.

Well, the girl's father happened to be a state senator. He called me immediately and not only called me, but called a couple of regents, and then sent copies of this poem to all the members of the Board of Regents, and to me, and demanded that Dave Phoenix be fired. Well, as I say, it was poor judgment on Dave's part to do this, poor judgment, first of all to inflict second-rate writing on his class. He obviously is not even as good a critic as he is a poet, or at least not of his own work. And I think poor judgment too, a kind of defiant poor judgment, because I think he knew that if it came out in any public way, it would add to the burden of a department of English already greatly upset about Paul Adamian. (If my dates are off—this was after the Adamian, after the Governor's Day think, so I'm not sure about my exact dates.) Frequent criticism, anyway, of teaching fellows in the English department, ninety percent of the time unjustified, you know. Parents often are not aware of the fact that a child who does poorly in school needs a scapegoat, and it's nearly always that instructor who didn't do right by him, but who in addition to that, gratuitously did a great many bad things in class. When I get complaints like this, I routinely check them out, by referring them to the chairman of the department of English and ask him to check them out, provided the complaint is not an anonymous kind of thing. And after checking them out, they're nearly always—not always, but nearly always—unfounded. But this one, we had, you know, the goods were there. He had done this.

It must have been in the spring of '71, because the legislature was about ready to

convene. Senator Titlow had told me that he planned to make this a major matter in the legislature unless we fired him. I explained to him first of all that Dave Phoenix had a contract and we don't, you know, that as a good business practice, we don't just summarily fire someone with a contract, but even if we could, anybody charged with anything is due to some kind of due process situation, a hearing of some kind, and that I would not summarily dismiss anyone without at least giving them the opportunity to claim a hearing.

That didn't satisfy him, and I spent a lot of time talking to Emerson not just on that first occasion, but on several other occasions, while the legislature was in session. And he began to understand privately, you know, when I'd talk to him just the two of us, and also to say, you know, "It really isn't that bad." But he had hold of a real hot political-type thing that could get him some publicity and he wasn't about to let go.

So you know, copies of this were placed on the desk of every member of the legislature, he appeared at a senate finance committee hearing on the University budget with a copy of this poem, and read portions of it, and with a comment, "Because the press is here, I cannot read the rest of it," you know, leaving blank spots and so on, making it much worse than it was.

As I had done on every other similar occasion, I had discussed this with the chairman of the English department, who had discussed it with Dave Phoenix, who said that in retrospect he wished he hadn't, that he did not intend to do the University damage, but apparently that was what was happening, that as a matter of fact, he would be willing to resign. My first reaction to that was no, because I was afraid that somebody had, you know, kind of pressured him into this,

and that wouldn't accomplish anything. But he really meant it, and he did resign toward the end of that semester, but it was after the legislature had adjourned— either that or after the senate finance committee meeting, which was the kind of high point of Titlow's use of this.

At any rate, it was not in any way a cause-effect kind of thing, and that's something else that just personally I didn't want to see happen, that Senator Titlow could feel that he had personally brought about this resignation. One of the reasons he resigned, he wanted to finish his degree, and teaching, it was taking too much of his time. And you know, he had other reasons, too, so it wasn't altogether this. But he was in no way pressured by anybody. If he had been, the whole University community would have heard about it, I'm quite sure. You know, the English department doesn't take to pressure of this sort [laughs], even if it were attempted on them.

Well, that gave us a lot of trouble in the legislature. Senator Titlow didn't really have that much influence in the legislature, but it was the kind of thing that once done, nobody dared, no politician dared come out and say, "Hey, that's great," or you know, "What's wrong with that?" So he had us in a kind of a box on this thing. That, plus some attitudes in the legislature about Governor's Day and some problems not related to disruption that we had with a couple of members of the faculty who had not met classes for—you know, had gone to six classes out of forty-five kind of thing, and there were two of those, as it happened. I don't know how the legislature found out about that, but I have my suspicions, and they were right on that, and they're no longer with us. (I'm getting way off.) The point is that all these were kind of building together to give us—and the governor's attitude toward me and the University was not very good, so everything was kind of bleak then.

But at any rate, the legislature finally adjourned, and we heaved a sigh of relief, but without giving sufficient thought to the campaign for the United States Senate. Bill Raggio was the Republican candidate running against Howard Cannon. He made this campaign issue, and he wanted to know for the record, publicly, all that we had done about the Phoenix case, and he wanted a copy of the poem released to him. And I refused to give him any of this information, and Neil Humphrey refused to give him any of this information. So he made this a campaign issue, that the dirty University needed cleaning up.

Not just [about] Dave Phoenix, but [Raggio] then got involved in wanting the same kind of information about Fred Maher, and Fred became really then the central part of his focus on the University. Fred Maher was one of the two people charged by the Board of Regents with disruption of Governor's Day. And he was the one about whom the charges were withdrawn because of insufficient evidence, on the advice of our counsel. Bill Raggio wanted, again, the information, he wanted a copy of the letter from Bert Goldwater, who was our special counsel on this case in which Bert recommended we drop the charges. He wanted a copy of my correspondence on this; he wanted a copy of the whole file on Fred Maher.

He called a press conference in which he read this—he called a press conference at eleven o'clock in the morning, as I recall, and said, "I have sent the following telegram to President Miller and received no response." And the telegram was a long one requesting all this information, and making a big thing of the fact that he'd receive no response. And I received the telegram about one-thirty that afternoon for the first time. I first knew about it when reporters started calling me,

and "What did you say to him?" And for much of the campaign, at least the first half of the campaign, this appeared in all his speeches, the news conferences that he kept calling about this. But I think he apparently made one mistake, and that was, it had some meaning up here in the north, people knew who Fred Maher was because there'd been a lot of publicity about this, and they knew that the charges had been dropped, but the first two or three major visits he made to Las Vegas, he kept using the same pitch, and it went over like a lead balloon. They didn't know who Fred Maher was, they had kind of vaguely heard about a Governor's Day disruption, but it didn't mean much to them, and they could care less anyway, you know. It Wasn't dear UNLV. So I think for that reason, he finally let up on the thing. But for a period of three or four months, it was as if I were running against him or something, instead of Howard Cannon, or that he was running against the University, instead of Howard Cannon.

Cannon, incidentally, called me very early, and so did Denver Dickerson, who was working with him. Both of them said that, "Right or wrong, good or bad, whether he did the right thing or the wrong thing, we're not about to make any comment on this in our campaign, no matter how hard Mr. Raggio pushes it. It's totally inappropriate." And I think, they were right, as far as senatorial campaign, you know, if he were running for the state senate, from the district in which the University is housed, maybe so, but for a United State Senate campaign, it was absurd.

That's really about all.

Did you feel that Mr. Raggio had access to certain kinds of information that might not have been otherwise?

He obviously, it seemed to me, had copies of most of the things he was demanding that we give him, by internal references to things that he was saying, that he knew more than he had any right from reading just the newspapers. I am confident, but it's obviously something I can't prove, he was getting some, strong support and advice from members of the University faculty, and this kind of thing. No matter how confidential you keep things of this sort, they are not really; within a community like this, as you know, they get out. And it wouldn't have been difficult for him to get it, and I think he had it.

One or two of his counselors from the University, I told them that I thought it was a great disservice to the University and that it was not helping the man in his campaign. And they disagreed thoroughly; they thought it would be the thing that would elect him. I must say that I couldn't have been happier on election night with the outcomes of an election. But there were a couple of members of the faculty, at least, maybe more, that were, I think, urging him to use this as an issue. And he did. But it faded away toward the last of his campaign, because I think he became aware that it wasn't helping. It was—he focused—you know, both the Phoenix thing and the Fred Maher thing, but Fred Maher was the central point. And Emerson Titlow with Dave Phoenix.

I was in Las Vegas for about a week shortly after the election, on a kind of a speaking tour, visitation tour, and speaking to service clubs and meeting with people, and I was on a couple of television programs. People in the news media, in particular at the television station, volunteered (I didn't refer to attempted Senator Raggio) you know, "What was that that Bill Raggio was talking about?" you know. And they said that that was just incomprehensible to the people in

Las Vegas, and the first part of his campaign was meaningless down there. They wanted to know what it was all about. They didn't care enough to ask him [laughs] what it was all about, until after it was over.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE BOARD OF REGENTS

The Board of Regents in 1965 was made up of nine members, three from Clark County and three from Washoe and three from the other counties, and by and large was a good board with a good mixture of people who had served on it a good many years, like Archie Grant and Louie [Louis] Lombardi and Fred Anderson and some relatively new members like Juanita White and Harold Jacobsen, Molly Knudtsen.

The first year or two I was here, the board not two full days, once a month. First day was committee meetings. The board operated with five or six very active committees: a committee on the physical plant and a committee on educational policy and a variety of other committees. These committees considered informally matters brought to them, and reached conclusions and then formally, the next day, on Friday, would make recommendations to the board what should be done formally. Everybody went to all the committee meetings, so it was in fact a two-day Board of Regents meeting, and the difference was that the press was excluded

from the Thursday meetings and included in on Friday, and understandably the press began to get restive about hearing only the formal motions made without knowing any of the discussion that went on the day before. So eventually the committee operation was virtually dropped; there is still some of it but not a great deal, and most matters now are discussed—except those that quite properly should be kept private—are discussed in open session with the press present.

The preparation for Board of Regents meeting was at a minimal level, to say the least, in the early days. There was no agenda, no formal agenda prepared ahead of time, just a kind of listing of some items that would come up before the plant and property committee, for example. And then Thursday night, President Armstrong's secretary would spend several hours typing out an agenda for Friday's meeting on the basis of Thursday's deliberations. This made it somewhat difficult to prepare adequately for matters that would come, because sometimes you didn't know which matters would come up. The board also

had no regular meeting schedule; at the end of each meeting they'd schedule the next month's meeting. And this made it extremely difficult to plan your own life, your own business life. If there were a professional meeting that you felt you should attend, you really couldn't commit yourself 'til two or three weeks ahead of time. These things changed. The biggest change took place after President Armstrong left. When Neil Humphrey assumed the role of chief officer for the Board of Regents, the present procedure of a regular schedule meeting set a year in advance and the detailed preparation of an agenda distributed in advance with supporting materials has become the routine. And it's a much more satisfactory way of operating.

There's a case in point of the kind of thing that could happen, and this one did happen at a regents' meeting. Toward the end of a regents' meeting in my first year here, I think in the fall of 1965, without any previous notice to anybody, Regent Lombardi got the floor and said, "I'd like to move that we name the department of journalism the Alfred Higginbotham Department of Journalism!" And Professor Higginbotham was alive and past retirement age but still teaching at the University at that time. It was the kind of thing, I suppose, that members of the Board of Regents who might have hesitated about wanting to name a department after anyone were a little reluctant to vote "No" on a motion of this sort, so the motion passed, and— a very unusual motion; I don't know of another department anyplace in the country that has a name attached to it. But it illustrates I think the kind of impromptu nature of regents' meetings and the way in which some things could happen.

The board, as was true then, and I think it's basically true now, despite now and then some evidences of partisanship on a sectional

basis, by and large I think board members, after they've been elected and served for a while, began really to function as regents for the whole System. And I don't have any major complaints... I can and probably will, as I go through this, cite some instances where there has been sectionalism rather rampant, but it doesn't happen often—and a lot less often than one would suppose in a situation where regents are elected by a limited constituency and are responsible therefore only, in those days, to the voters of a given county or group of counties. They operated pretty well as regents for the whole University, and I think by and large they continue to do this. There have been efforts made by legislators, by the press and occasionally by members of the administration of the University (as in the case of Don Moyer), to create this kind of division but not very successfully.

The reapportionment of the board took place in 1970, I guess. This involved adding two additional members of the board; the two added were from Clark County. And this was done as a way of getting at a reapportionment of the board so there would be from Clark County, not three regents, but five, and then three from Washoe County and three from the rest of the state. One of the two new members elected at that time was James Bilbray. And there were some problems at the beginning of his term with him on the matter of sectionalism. He was, for the first year or so he served on the board, outspokenly pro-Las Vegas and on some issues rather outspokenly anti-Reno, the most interesting case being the Medical School problem, where at one point he told his colleagues on the board, and indeed followed through on this, that it was his intention to file a minority report with the legislature disapproving of the board's action in which the board had approved the creation of the Medical School.

He was very, very strongly opposed to approval of a medical school in Reno, and did in fact make statements to legislators opposing this, which is one of the few breaks in the unity of the board in its appearances before the legislature, and I think demonstrates the kind of always there always potential danger of this method of electing boards of regents, members of board of regents, on a limited-constituency basis. To his credit, as time passed, I think he became more and more understanding of the need to support all of education, including the developing community colleges, and as time passed, the instances of this kind of thing decreased. But [it] didn't disappear altogether because as recently as this present year, when the money became available from the federal government for about five million dollars from refund of slot machine tax money—federal tax money—for constructions of buildings for higher education, the legislature had committed about three and a half million dollars of this for community college buildings and the rest of it was to be used for the two campuses, the staff—administrative staff—had developed a way of spending this money which would've put about half of it—about equal parts—rather large parts—on the two major campuses and a smaller third part would go into the building of an administrative office for the System officers, for the chancellor and his staff. This came to a vote for approval by the Board of Regents at a meeting in Las Vegas. I had assumed that all of the administrative staff had agreed to this, and perhaps that's true, because President Zorn at the meeting made no comment one way or the other but Regent Bilbray and Regent Morris very quickly introduced a motion that had the effect of placing an amount into the Las Vegas fund in order to build a swimming pool for Las Vegas. And as it happened there were only

nine regents present of the eleven. Trying to be sure of my numbers—there must've been ten regents there because the five regents from Las Vegas were all there, including Archie Grant). And Archie, by this time, was in a wheelchair and attended meetings in Las Vegas but often left early. And in the course of debate on this matter, at one point, Archie put his hat on and asked Ray Germain to push him out of the room for some purpose. And there was a real note of dismay on the part of the other Las Vegas regents. He did leave the room and while he was gone, they did a lot of talking. The minute he came back, they called for a vote on the motion and the motion passed with the five Las Vegas regents plus Mel Steninger, who was still I think somewhat angry with me at that stage, voting for this redistribution of the money. I mention this as a recent instance of what now is a rare occurrence of this sort of thing, but it can and does occasionally happen.

For what it's worth, I've been for the last four or five years publicly talking about (to the dismay of some of the regents who've told me) that in this state it would be highly desirable to have regents appointed by the governor, with terms that would extend beyond any one governor's period of service. I think the chances of getting people with real commitment to the University and of getting a proper geographical spread and this sort of thing would be eased. I do this as a matter of principle because I genuinely mean this; I don't think we have—I think we've been very fortunate in this state to have regents who are dedicated people and who've exercised wisdom in the operation of the University, the whole system, and while I don't always like the actions they take, I think that's normal. I think they do represent the state quite well. I don't have any quarrel with the regents, but I think the principle—the way in which

they're elected—has presented some problems that need not be there and always has the potential for rather serious problems in the governance of the University System designed to serve the whole state. It's a little different than representing a small segment of people in a legislature. I think there is a difference here. For example, the students we receive on this campus, a good many of them come from Las Vegas, and it would be unfair to have—it *is* unfair to have—the notion being that a Las Vegas regent must support only the University in Las Vegas, when in fact some of his constituents are students here as well. And I also believe that the health of the institution here is part of the health of the whole System, and if one part's weak, then we all suffer. I didn't mean to get off on that, but—.

At the May meeting of the Board of Regents in Elko after Governor's Day, that week, the first day of the meeting when the Board of Regents filed their charges against two members of the faculty, in what I thought was a very inappropriate way of doing it—. With the strong feeling they had, they should have directed me to do something, rather than naming by name two people, which presented great difficulties to me and to them about carrying on any kind of a hearing. They were the prosecutors and the final arbiters, final judges on these two cases. And the kinds of comments that were made in the open session of the board—it wasn't even done in personnel session—about the Governor's Day thing. That night, I wrote a letter of resignation, because the thing that I've commented on before, it seemed to me was coming to pass, that the campus was about to be put back into the nineteenth century in terms of speaker policy and the right of students and faculty for real free speech, and to take unpopular causes. And I didn't like the way they handled it, but their right to take unpopular stands was

very important to me. And so I wrote a letter of resignation, which I truly meant. If this was to be the outcome, I didn't want to be the “lord high executioner” of the freedom of the campus. And I gave it to Neil Humphrey the next morning, not knowing, because of the way we are organized, in—you know, I report directly to the Board of Regents, but there's some kind of line relationship, too, in some things, with the chancellor. The chancellor in the case of the selection of a new president, plays a fairly important role, so I assumed that I should hand this to him, or the chairman of the Board of Regents. And he talked me out of it, or at least talked me into waiting a while. So it got no further than that. I was very tired, and emotionally spent as they were, and he kept telling me that, and he was right.

But I mention this because [by 1972] there had been one other occasion when I had, with real conviction, prepared a letter of resignation and really meant it. I think ultimately things worked out all right, so I guess I'm glad that I didn't, that Neil talked me out of it, on that occasion.

But to come to the November, 1971 resignation, this was a different thing. One reason it was different was that it was not, either on my part or on the regents' part, an outgrowth of any particular crisis situation. It was more a kind of a chronic illness, if you will, instead of an acute one.

I had had some considerable problems with Mel Steninger and Bill Morris as members of the Board of Regents. They were alike in some ways, in light of what the problems were, but different in some ways, too. But it brought the two of them together, and in a very close alliance. And they still are, as a matter of fact. They sit next to each other regularly at board meetings now, and I'm kind of a focal point [laughs], I guess, of their togetherness.

The case of Mel Steninger, the big problem, in my opinion (and all of this is obviously my own analysis), is that he's an extraordinarily conservative person about almost everything— not quite everything, but almost. He has said to me as we walked across the campus on more than one occasion and seen males with long hair, that he can't abide it, that it just irritates the hell out of him. So the lifestyles of the young people who are on our campuses, you know, that's enough in itself to make him feel that society has just gone to ruin. And when there are manifestations of it in ways other than the personal dress and appearance of a student, where he feels that somebody "in authority" should use that authority, then he gets irritated because it's not used. That's a long way of saying, you know, if we have a problem in one of the residence halls, about a male and a female student caught sleeping together, as in one case in point, then I'm lax in the management of the University, you know. Why don't I stop things like that. I'm too liberal.

And that's really, I think, in my opinion, the heart of his problem with me is that I don't take charge well enough, that I leave everything either to individuals to do their own thing without regard to any set of rules, or that I turn everything over to a committee, and that no decisions really are made, and when they're made, they're made because I'm afraid to run counter to, you know, what anybody wants. It's like, you know, flow with the tide, no matter what the tide is, kind of thing. I don't think that's true, but, you know, that's his opinion —or at least it's my opinion of what his opinion is. Basically, I think, he feels that things are just far too liberal on this campus, students and faculty, programs, that the administration just sits around and lets things happen that shouldn't be allowed to happen. And that there is no control really,

that nobody's in charge and that "By God, the president should be in charge," you know. That's the basic kind of problem that I think he sees with my administration.

Bill Morris, I think, shares that feeling too, to some extent, but more particularly as it applies to athletics, and I think a great share of our problem between Bill and me, is that I do not believe in a major intercollegiate movement on this campus. I believe very strongly in a good intercollegiate program, a lot -more strongly than a lot of my faculty and students believe or want me to believe, really. I enjoy watching football and basketball games, and I think we should have good teams, and we should put some money into it, but I. do not believe we ought to drain the resources of the University to build up great machines. I think we need to find our level (and I think I've commented on athletics before) and stay with a good level. I don't want a two hundred thousand-dollar or half million-dollar program in athletics. But he does, and he's constantly disappointed that I'm not doing that, and that I'm not more forceful in telling [faculty] senate committees that want to look at the program in intercollegiate athletics to go to hell, you know. I repeat, I think he shares some of the generalized global feeling that Mel Steninger does about the administration of the University. Combined with that, his tremendous positive feeling about UNLV makes this campus a rival; you know, it's as if he were a competing regent for UNLV *only*, and that anything we do here is in competition to what they're doing there, and therefore draining their resources.

Maybe this analysis is wrong, but things they've said to me both privately and at the time of this November business dealt mostly with firmness of control, the lack thereof, and with inability to make decisions. Bill didn't talk much about athletics at the November

time. That doesn't go as well with the total board as with some members of the board, so it's not a big thing for them. But it's mostly authority and decision making and control—and control, I think, is a key work here. I not only don't operate in terms of control, but I think anyone who believes that leadership in any situation is very much more than a *persuasion* kind of situation is unrealistic. I think even the armed services are discovering that in the prototype of the hierarchy, you know, that the giving of orders is not really the effective way to accomplish things. So there's a philosophic difference between what they say they expect from me, and the way that I think any of us have to operate. Maybe it's a self-serving kind of rationalization, but pressed to the point, I think that the other administrative officers of this System would have to admit that there's no way that they can really get things done by issuing orders, and they would be out of their minds if they tried to do it. As I've said just a few minutes ago, I can't even order outsiders out of this office [laughs], certainly not faculty or students on this campus.

But I think this is really the—it's a matter of the control kind of thing, and a kind of campus that I envision where people do have opportunities to make themselves heard, not just on their subject matter areas, but about the way the University is. You know, it's not *my* university, it belongs, true, to the people of the state, and that's why we should have lay regents, but it also belongs very closely and very much on a day-to-day basis to the faculty and the students here. And they should have some input into what happens here. The days of strong presidents, I don't believe, ever existed in that kind of context. I think they found it easier to do persuasion than we do now; it's not because they were more forceful in issuing orders; maybe a little more, but

people took orders a little better maybe fifty years ago than they do now. Well, I think this is the basis of the philosophic difference between these two in particular.

With respect to the other members of the board, these two men, I had known from the beginning of their service from the board, after the first month or so, were very dissatisfied with my manner of operation. It was very clear. And I spent a lot of time in talking to them. I have gone both to Elko and to Las Vegas just to see them prior to this November thing, and had a very long breakfast meeting with Bill Morris one morning in Las Vegas, and went out to Mel Steninger's home and visited with him, you know, to try to both explain what I was trying to do and so that they could explain what their concept of what should be happening here is. And I must say, we got along personally very well. As a matter of fact, Mel Steninger, I think in particular, harbors no kind of personal animosity, you know. He often seeks me out at social gatherings to chit-chat, and I do the same with him; to a lesser extent with Bill Morris. But there's no reconciliation, particularly with Mel Steninger, because I think it's a basic, deep, philosophic kind of thing. With Bill I think it's more pragmatic, you know. I don't think he has that deep a feeling, but he's committed himself publicly now, so he's stuck [laughs] with me, you know.

The other members of the board—from time to time, I've had problems, I think, I guess, with all of them, but that's par for the course. Something would be wrong if we always agreed, all of us. I've had fewer problems, I think, with Molly Knudtsen than with anyone else, because I think she, in my opinion, comes closer to being the right kind of regent in the sense of being only occasionally concerned about day-to-day operation of the University. Once in while,

she has; it's human, I know, to poke into some very trivial administrative kind of thing, but not often. And she has an amazingly good notion about what a faculty is like, and what a university is about. When I say all these good things, she has the kind of perception of the university that a faculty has, and therefore, that's why I think it's the right kind; it's like an insider, really, viewing the University. And maybe that's not good or healthy, but it's presented fewer problems between her and me than the number of problems or the frequency with other members of the board.

Harold Jacobsen and I have got along very well. He's a very conservative person also, but, I think I've mentioned on another occasion, he is truly willing to listen and change his mind, and to react in ways different than he originally thought he would react. And that's great. He's not stuck in one position forever.

I have frequent problems with Fred Anderson. We're very close friends, but he doesn't like a lot of things that happen on campus. He's a *very* conservative person, which is kind of ironic, because my understanding, at least, is that he was elected to the Board originally as a kind of flaming liberal, a young Turk to help clean up the Stout mess. I think a lot of his friends of that era who are still around are not fully aware of how conservative he is. So we disagree on a lot of things like that. He's also so deeply wrapped up in the Medical School that he gets involved in...a lot of things he shouldn't on this. He wants to hire people, and this kind of thing. But we're close enough friends so we have our arguments on particular matters, and they're over and done with. I don't mind telling him to keep out of this, and he's not apt to do it often, but at least we have a good enough relationship.

Louis Lombardi and I get along, personally, great. His wife and my wife are good friends.

He's not really a very active member of the Board, and his chief concern is with athletics, but in a reasonable way. I don't think he is upset as Bill Morris is with the *kind* of program we have, as long as *it* is supported.

The other Las Vegas regents: Helen Thompson is a very strange person. We've got along very well, and she's developed into a reasonably good regent. She, at first, didn't show much interest at all in this campus. She was and is a student at UNLV, and because she knows that campus a lot better, she really gives Jay Zorn a harder time than she does me, because she takes to board meetings occasional problems about parking and lighting on campus, things of that sort. She misses a good many board meetings, and you know, parts of them, but we've never had any major problems.

Archie Grant, in the years that I've been on the Board, has been fine, but not very much with it, really. A very nice human being, I think; my contacts with him have been that way.

Jim Bilbray gave us a hard time when he first came on the board, mostly centered around the Medical School, but also around athletics, too. He's been very active in the Boosters Club in Las Vegas. But since he decided to run for congress, he's been eminently fair with us [laughs]. He obviously was thinking about these votes up north. He prides himself on his rapport with students, and I think, understands more about what students are like than many of the other board members. I don't think lie has as strong a rapport as he thinks he does, but at least he does understand them better, and I think, therefore, his actions on matters relating to students have been generally pretty good for both campuses.

About, oh, maybe two weeks before the [November, 1971] meeting, Neil Humphrey

told me that the regents wanted to have a session with me privately after the conclusion of the rest of the meeting, and told me what little he knew of what their problems were. And I think he told me everything he knew, that it was primarily Bill Morris and Mel Steninger who had some questions and concerns about black students on the campus, about Jesse Sattwhite, about student misbehavior, lack of control in the dormitories, that kind of thing. We had scheduled a trip to Europe as part of the Institute of European Studies, which the University belongs to. They were having their annual meeting of the presidents' council, the presidents of the institutions, in Vienna. And in order to make the connections for the group flight, we had to be in New York, as I recall, that Saturday evening. Well, the extra time with the regents meant that we cancelled out on the flight. So that's the first thing that happened, that our first trip to Europe went down the drain.

But after the regents meeting, that Saturday morning, after everything was over, I met with them for about an hour, and the comments were almost altogether from Steninger and Morris, and they were pretty much as Neil had outlined them. Mel thought I was too liberal, with the students and the faculty, that I didn't exercise any control on faculty actions that come to the Board of Regents, that I had really kind of disobeyed the regents in a couple of instances. One of them was in the case of Fred Maher, which was a complicated kind of thing. I had had a discussion with Dean Kirkpatrick in the spring, prior to this November meeting, about Fred Maher, and had made the point that he was a teaching fellow of the English department [and they] had told me that they would like to see him move on, for his own good as much as anything else, 'cause he wasn't making much progress toward a degree. I

thought the best interest of all of us would be served would be not to review his contract. And Dean Kirkpatrick agreed and had talked to the English department and they had agreed. So I thought there was understanding about this.

While I was off on vacation, that summer though, I called back one time and talked to Jim Anderson and was told not only had Fred Maher—that he had signed—the contract had come through for Fred as a teaching fellow for the fall, and that as far as he knew, that this was what Fred expected, and the Dean and the chairman of the department. I was quite surprised, but what we finally worked out was that we would not put him in the classroom, that we would give him a research assistantship for the same amount of money, working with John Morrison and Bob Harvey, which suited Fred much better, really, 'cause he could spend more time on his degree, and that we would not pay him out of state funds, but pay him out of one of the small endowment funds that we have under my control.

And as soon as I got back, I went down to see Harold Jacobsen, told him what had happened, and how we'd worked this out. He wasn't real happy, but it was the best solution under the circumstances. I reported this to the regents at the September meeting, so I wasn't trying to hide anything about it, but that irritated Mel Steninger in particular.

This really, was you know, a real—it wasn't a severe castigation of anything, it was a kind of an accumulation of a whole series of little things like this, and Jesse Sattwhite was a major thing. The kind of liberal position that they interpreted my having with respect to blacks on the campus, giving them anything they asked for, which is ironic, because it was just, I guess that very month, or the month before, when I'd called police on [laughs]

the campus with respect to blacks. But, that situation irritated them too, that they felt I should not have given a week's delay, before the final action on the office problem. That that was a sign of what they were talking about, of indecisiveness and weakness and refusal to take action.

The rest of the board—. It was a kind of a curious meeting, because Fred Anderson had to leave the meeting early, and as I recall wasn't even there at all on Saturday morning; he had a meeting in Utah or someplace that he had to go to. And Louis Lombardi was not at the meeting; he was in Europe. And I believe one other regent was not there. The rest of the regents, except for Proc Hug, who spoke up several times in my defense, the rest of them just sat there, and it was extremely difficult for me to interpret what that meant. The only conclusion I could reach was that except for Proc, they were agreeing by saying nothing, and so, I didn't argue, I didn't choose to deal with each of these cases one by one and get involved in a big squabble, because they were as convinced that they were right as I was [that I] was right. I interpret the stun product of all this, that I don't think any one of the things was that big, but the stun of it represented a kind of basic difference in approach toward leadership in the University. And as I indicated earlier, I had on earlier occasions discussed this with the two individual regents with not really any success.

So I did make a few comments to correct some matters of fact and I don't recall what these were, but right now they weren't that important. But mostly, I listened. And I said to them then that, "If it is the feeling of the board, you know, if this is the feeling of the board, as Bill Morris said, 'We're just not getting our money's worth from you.' If this is the feeling of the board, then I think the only proper thing for you and for me is for me to

resign, and I will see to it that you have a letter of resignation on file either with the chairman of the board or with the chancellor early next week." And that really kind of concluded the meeting. Just left that way.

Neil and I had lunch together after that. As I've indicated we have differences from time to time, but we're, I think, very close friends, and I think he was very perturbed. And we agreed that he and I would get together on Monday to discuss the near future. I did not have a job waiting for me, nor do I have enough money to leave a job without some notion about where I'll turn next. So my intention was to stay the rest of the year in a teaching capacity, or to exercise my option with tenure to see through that year.

And that presented some—in the midst of all this rather black Saturday—some happy prospects, I must confess. The more I thought about it, the better it sounded. And we kind of left it that way. I came back very despondent, you know. It's easy to talk about it now, objectively, but it's the kind of thing, at the time, you don't take very objectively.

I really was not angry, in a "getting mad at" kind of way, with Morris and Steninger, because I knew that this was the kind of attitude—but I was upset and I was very puzzled by the action of the rest of the regents, people like Molly Knudtsen, for example, who was there, and Harold Jacobsen. None of them have agreed with me all the time on anything, nor have I agreed with them, but I thought basically, that they were not terribly dissatisfied at least.

Well, we came back. My son at that time was working at the airport as—he called it as a 'change girl' at the slot machines. He was back in Reno in between his trips to Taiwan. and he had worked there for a while and they all liked him, so when he is in town for longer than a week, he works out at the slot machines. He

could tell. When I got off the plane, I saw him, and so he asked me what had happened, and I told him that I had just been fired or words to that effect, and he was madder than the devil. It really, really got to him. He knows all the local regents and others, but he immediately turned away and wouldn't speak to them, and you know, in kind of a strange reaction, but a nice one, I guess.

At any rate, I went down first thing Monday morning to talk to Neil about between November and the starting of the second semester using up my accrued annual leave time, staying on teaching in the second semester, applying for, with assurances that Neil would support my getting a sabbatical for the following fall if I were still here. You know, it was a very nice and generous kind of package that he was putting together, and very tempting. I was beginning to feel really quite good about it.

I came back to this office about nine o'clock, and somebody called me and said, "the Las Vegas newspapers had flaming headlines about your being fired." And it turned out to be true, and literally big red headlines. Somebody leaked the story. And not I, believe me. And not Neil. But I have my theory. I think it may have gone out in some fashion from Bill Morris. Bill was and is still, very close to the governor. I guess I'm not one of his favorite people, and so it's conceivable that he may have reported this to the governor, who in turn—I don't know, it may have got out in some fashion like that.

Whoever did it, if their real desire was to see me leave, it was a very bad tactical error. If nothing had been said about this, my resignation as president would have been on hand on Monday afternoon or Tuesday morning, quietly. I do not believe in creating a furor on something like this. You know, no principle about academic freedom at the

University or things like this were at stake. It was something between me and the board. I can see certain kinds of situations where I'd raise hell about being fired, but not when it's a personal kind of thing. So I had no intention of doing more than quietly moving from administration into teaching. But it got out, and it was played up *very* big in Las Vegas, and very big in Reno.

Then people began, I guess, meeting together and forming some kind of committee on an *ad hoc* basis, that—or at least I got phone calls from one group at least that met at the Thornton house; I don't know who all, but—the Thorntons and Dan Klaich and Joe Crowley, I guess, and Hugh Mozingo, the chairman and vice chairman of the senate, and some others. They were trying to formulate some kind of plan of action, and wanted me to participate in this, but I would not. And I honestly did not. (I think, you know, at some point, if this is important enough, you may want to interview, or as you interview other people, ask them about this, because they know more than I do.) But I would have no part in tryin' to "stir up the natives" to keep my job. As I say, you know, the alternative that was waiting me was not that bad.

So I, much to Barbara Thornton's real dismay, I—she was *very* irritated with me because I would not lift a finger. From her standpoint, though, to move ahead, she and some of the others decided after the fact a week later, that maybe that was the best thing from their point of view, that maybe if I had come out into the fray and fought for my job (which would have been very inappropriate under this set of circumstances, in my opinion), that it might have done more harm than good in terms of the outcome. But I wasn't thinking about that. I just honestly didn't think it was *the* issue to get involved in a public battle with the regents about. I wrote

a letter of resignation and released it to the press and then I had no more to say. And I really didn't, for the rest of the week.

The students had a mass meeting on campus, and the faculty—there was a faculty meeting. Both of them were very supportive and an enormous number of letters and telegrams that came to me, and I understand, by the grapevine, a good many more that went to the chancellor and the Board of Regents. It's kind of personally very heartening thing, you know, in some respects, like the "N. Edd Miller Day" we talked about earlier, to find a lot of people who were genuinely concerned, but also to find a good many people who were—and I think even more who were concerned about the University—and I don't mean that in a selfless kind of way, but I think it is heartening to know that—and maybe it is selfish too, because, I think it was a kind of confirmation, from my selfish point of view, of what was happening to the University during the last six or seven years as being—they viewed as being a good thing. A lot of their concerns were about the University and the specter of the Stout problems kept coming up, and was referred to frequently in some of the communications I got, as not wanting that kind of thing to happen, particularly with the kinds of actions that came about during the firings and things of this sort that came about during the Stout turmoil.

So, you know, it was kind of a mixed thing; it was very nice personally to find a lot of people support me personally. But I think the nice combination of personal and institutional thing, of real concern for the University, that I think manifested itself from a lot of people. A lot of people that I had had disagreements with, and that I was surprised, really, to see come through in this kind of way. People who had objected to liberal speaker policy or a variety of other things, nonetheless

when this set of chips was down, at least, were supportive.

Well, I think you know, and the press coverage of the things that happened during the week, I think, is a matter of record. The regents called a special meeting for Saturday morning, on the following Saturday morning, and met in executive session at the chancellor's office, I guess for about an hour. Neil had asked me to be in my office on a standby basis, ready to come down if they wanted me to. So I was here, and he called about an hour after the scheduled meeting time, and I went down and met with the board.

They were all present except Archie Grant at this meeting. Archie's health had made it impossible for him to travel. Some reporter had called him, however, about how he thought about this, and as I recall his statement was typically Archie Grant, that, "Oh I think he's fine, lie's got his eccentricities, but we all do," sort of answer.

Helen Thompson had called me earlier in the week, Wednesday or Thursday, as soon as the meeting was announced, to apologize for not being able to come to the Saturday meeting. She said she very much had to be in Southern California that week and just couldn't be there, but wanted me to know that she supported me. But she came to the meeting. She changed her plans, which I thought was a very fine thing.

At the meeting with the regents, they kind of went around the table, and they each made little speeches. Eight of the speeches were very strongly favorable, and two of them (much to their credit), Morris and Steninger said they'd meant what they'd said earlier and they still believed that way. But they also recognized that they were in the minority on the board, and they'd continue to try to work with me, or some words to that effect, which, you know, was fine. I would have thought much less of

them if they'd either been quiet or appeared to accede to the rest of the board.

So I had in my pocket, I recall, three possible statements prepared for them and for the press that I knew was besieging the Arlington Towers [laughs]. I understood they had University police there to keep people out of the elevators and a variety of other things. One statement that I had prepared was in the event the majority of the board had agreed with Steninger and Morris. A second statement was in the event the board was kind of split on it; you know, a six to five vote wouldn't have been good, even though it would have been a majority. And the third one was for the eight to two kind of thing, or what I considered a substantial expression on the part of the board. So that's the one that I used. Then after I expressed to them my desire to work as closely as possible within the wishes of the board (and I mean that; that's part of my job description), and that I respected Mr. Morris and Mr. Steninger but that with this kind of support from the board, that I would stay on. And then they opened the meeting to the press and the students who were out in the hallway. And that I guess, about finishes it.

One thing—as I mentioned, Louis Lombardi was out of town at the original meeting. I guess he wasn't in Europe, but he wasn't at the meeting. He and his wife were in Southern California or someplace, and they saw this on the wire services, and they came back to Reno two or three days early because of this, and called us and insisted that Nena and I go out to dinner with them. And we were kind of lying low during this week, staying at home and trying to be as quiet as we could. But they would not take no for an answer, and they took us, not only out to eat, but took us to a very public place. They wanted, I'm sure, very kindly, just wanted to be seen with us,

you know, as a kind of symbolic gesture of support, which was very nice of them.

I really don't know how to appraise this situation. The confusing thing was the silence of members of the Board of Regents who made extraordinarily strong statements the following Saturday. I've since talked to Proc Hug at some length about this, and his feeling, and I think he may be right, is that they were taken by surprise at the time of the first meeting, as really I was, by the intensity of feeling of the two regents. And I don't think they knew what was really coming up.

I've neglected to mention a very important thing. At the first meeting, when I first met with them, either Morris or Steninger—one or the other—made the motion to fire me, and the other seconded it, and Jacobsen wouldn't accept the motion, which is about all he said at that first meeting. So the motion was made and seconded, but not put to a vote.

But I think they were, all of them, kind of taken by surprise Fred Anderson also, subsequently, said, "If I'd known what was really gonna happen, I wouldn't have left." So maybe that is a reasonable way to account for it. But the statements from Jacobsen and from Knudtsen and Anderson and Helen Thompson, everyone, you know, were very strong, very positive statements—realistic statements, you know. They understand that we don't always have to agree to live together.

I don't think it was a constitutional crisis for the University. I really do not, as some people seem to make out. Except for one aspect of it, and that's not a constitutional kind of crisis, but it is a *style* kind of crisis. The substantive part of it, I think, aside from the particular attitudes about my particular actions, is the style of leadership, and a kind of control," that the Board of Regents expected in the University. In that sense, it was a very important issue to the University about which

I have so many prejudices that I cannot speak dispassionately, you know. I obviously feel very strongly about allowing students to lead their own lives, and faculty to lead their own lives, and for all of them to have some kind of say in the institution of which they're a part. So I can't speak objectively about that. If that were an issue, and I think in the sum, was an issue, then I think it was an important thing for the University. But you arrive at that conclusion only by a process of addition of the particulars, and the reason I didn't feel that it was appropriate at all for me to get involved in a public argument with the board on this was that the things focused on were these particulars. I do not believe—still don't—the best interests of the University would have been served by my arguing about whether Jesse Sattwhite got too much financial aid, you know, and that's the kind of thing would have been the issue, or the issues, if this had been a public debate. And the important, additive kind of total issue, would have been so obscured, that I think it could have been a real disservice to the University, rather than doing it good.

Was there any aspect of this thing that made you more pleased, or more displeased than any other, with the faculty with the students, with the alumni, with the people out in the state, with the individual regents?

That one's really hard to answer, when you use the word pleased, you know. The support did come very strongly from students, and that pleases me, because I have a thing about their involvement; and from faculty and that pleases me considerably, to no end; and alumni. I think the surprising pleasantness was the support out in the state. Now I don't know how many letters came to Morris and Steninger, you know, maybe the outpouring was as strong the other way. And I don't know

what letters went to Humphrey and Jacobsen, either. But I did get copies of a lot of things, and I got letters and telegrams and phone calls directed to me. And so many of them, from people in the state, which surprised me, in a pleasant kind of way. My feeling about someone like Molly Knudtsen was one of real enormous relief because if I'd been asked the Friday before the Saturday when the first meeting took place, you know, who would come closer to agreeing with the kind of thing you're trying to do on the campus than anyone else on the Board, I would have quickly said, "Molly Knudtsen." And then when she said nothing, at that session, that puzzled me all week long, considerably. But she made [a] very strong statement, and very sincerely the following Saturday. don't know how to answer your question.

I just wondered if there was some aspect to it that was particularly good, or somehow disappointing. A lot of people did see this as some kind of crisis in the University's life, because, as you say, the style.

Well, in that sense it is, but it was so confused. It wasn't a clearly stated issued, and to have engaged in a public debate about it would have obscured the real issue, or that ultimate issue, so badly that lines would be drawn on things that in the long run don't matter, really. You know, it really doesn't make that much difference how much financial aid Jesse Sattwhite got. But it does make a lot of difference, it seems to me, in how this University grows with the times, about the kind of parental control that regents exercise over it. It's like raising your own children; if you smother them with rules, they'll never amount to anything. It very easily could have been turned into a very personal kind of "Miller is saving his job" kind of thing, and I'd already worked out, prior to the news releases

on this, a way that was totally satisfactory as an interim thing for me. I also felt that if something would have been bought unanimously by the board, I don't—you know—they weren't after me as an individual, they were after me as president of the University. And I don't think either Steninger or Morris would object at all to my being a teaching member of this faculty. So I had no fear about that, and it was comforting to know that I had a fallback position. And as I say, the more I thought about it, the more attractive this became with, you know, the end up—how I want to end my career anyway, back in teaching, and to do it with a reasonably good salary and under a nice set of circumstances, except for the way I got there [laughs].

Have you changed anything about the way you administer the office now as a result of this, or as an outgrowth of it?

Not consciously. If I have, I think the only thing that I may—one thing that was referred to [was] the very long time it takes to get things done, and I may have since that time become more demanding on time schedules. But I think that criticism was not at the time a completely fair criticism to direct at that style of leadership. If you have any kind of senate, for example, dealing with any kind of problem, there's not much I can do to speed it up, you know. Once they tackle a problem, they do it at their own speed. Except for possibly that, and I don't—nothing consciously. You're a faculty member, maybe you'd see things, but I don't think so.

I wondered if you felt that you could afford to be more innovative or you had become more cautious because of this criticism

I don't think markedly either way. It seemed in the, talk I made the following week,

it seemed to me what I was trying to convey is that we should go on about our business, and by inference what I was trying to say was that, I don't have any intention of exploiting this situation, and I hope I have not. You know, in some ways, it'd be like a prime minister getting a vote of confidence and then joining that Common Market, or something like that, kind of against the wishes of the people in a way. To go to that side, I think would not be appropriate. I will absolutely refuse to live in fear of holding my job. I hope this is not vainglory, but I do have enough confidence in my record prior to administration, and I've tried to keep up enough so that I think I can get a satisfactory living out of a teaching job. So I'm not worried about a job. As I say, there may be some temporary problems for a few months. To be caught in November without a job is one thing, but I refuse to be more cautious. At least I hope all this is true; I don't know how I'm reacting without my own knowledge. But to exploit it either way, I think would be a mistake. And I don't mean what I've just said—to say—you know, "Thank God, I've got a perfect system, so we'll just continue with that." By no means.

And I recognize the validity of some of the criticism. The Fred Maher thing should never have happened, and I accept responsibility for that. There was a breakdown in communication and I'm responsible for this kind of communication about the continuation of him that following year after thinking we had an understanding. You know, there're ways, always; there ought to be a constant attention to ways of improving what we're doing, just like I'm sure you look for ways to improve what you're doing right now. So I'm not that complacent.

I don't want to leave the impression that every communication I got was in favor of me, because I got some, too, that—well, that, you

know, said in effect, “It’s about time, hooray for the regents” kind of thing. Not many, but I did get a few, and that’s sobering, too, you know, and I understand that position. The thing that pleased me was that there were not more of them. There weren’t as many as I thought there would be in a situation like this, from out in the state.

And there were a good many petitions from departments and schools and colleges on campus. Some of these had surprises in them. There were signatures on them that I didn’t expect, in some cases, supporting me. And there were also names that didn’t appear that I thought might appear, too [laughs]. But, you know, from within fifteen minutes after a person accepts a job like this, and is on the job, if he’s got any sense at all, and wants to keep his sanity, he recognizes that there is no real honeymoon period, you know. From the first thing that you do on, you make some people happy and some people unhappy. And so I have never expected unanimous support. That’s absurd.

Nor do I believe so strongly that I’m totally right that I can get unhappy with people who disagree with me, and don’t support me. There are some that I think use ways and methods that I don’t approve of. I don’t like that. But the ones that openly (and there are a lot of them on the faculty), that openly don’t like the way I run things, and/or the fact that I don’t run things [laughs], and I know who they are and we talk about it, you know—that’s fine, I don’t expect them to sign petitions to keep me on the job. Some of them are good friends, too. But we have a very basic disagreement about this. There are a few that I’m not friends with, because I think they don’t operate in open and above ways. So I got some negative votes along the way, too.

One of the attractive things about being in a university community is that it’s the most exciting collection of individuals in the world. And that’s true of any university, you know;

it’s a stimulating place to be with stimulating people. But I think there is a problem about a president reaching the kinds of levels of friendship that we’ve had when we were teaching, when I was teaching. And I guess we just have become more cautious about this kind of thing, and we’ve probably tended to seek close friends from off campus more than we’ve sought them on campus. And it really isn’t—you know, not wanting to associate with our own. It came to, you know, that week, when we wanted some people to talk to—. It maybe is a kind of good case in point that we have a couple of very close personal friends on the faculty, but we don’t—I think this isn’t well known, you know—the Craig Sheppards and the Millers are very close personal friends, but we don’t flaunt this in any way. I guess that’s what I’m trying to say, that we don’t want to get things started, that the president has a narrow little group of friends on the faculty, and so every time one of ’em gets a raise or promotion or something, well, it’s because of his influence. It’s that kind of thing.

I mentioned before the Thorntons, who are close friends, who are not University people, or were not until this coming semester when Barbara will be teaching. I guess among the close friends we have are the David Vhays, an architect in town. And that week, they were over at our house one evening, and we went to their house one evening, and we spent time with them. And with the Sheppards, and with a few other friends. They were very kind to us that week. This is a very difficult thing to talk about, because it can be so easily misunderstood. We find opportunities to see a lot of the faculty. I think we’re a little reluctant to get real deep roots with very many. I don’t want to be taken advantage of, either. I don’t think the kind of people we would be close to would do this, but there’s always a risk. Well, that’s about all, just a kind of passing thought I had.

SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

There are some other organizational matters that while we're on this broad topic—maybe about four or five minutes on something like this.

One of the things that I think necessarily must concern a college president is how he organizes, or how the institution organizes to accomplish educational goals in the most efficient way. I've thought a lot about this and in particular context and also in a kind of broad way. I'm not sure that there is any certain single simplistic answer to this. I think much of it has to be by the nature of what the subject matter is or the kinds of objectives you want to achieve for faculty and students and the community and so on. So in some cases, in order to maximize our resources to the best possible way, I have been pushing very hard for interdisciplinary kinds of things in an area that I'm quite interested in; that is, opportunities for international study. It seems to me there are a lot of ways this can go. We can bring visiting scholars here and we can affiliate ourselves (as we have) with an organization that provides a year abroad

without our having to do it ourselves. To get the kind of international experience available either on campus or abroad for students and faculty. And it seems to me that you need to deal with each thing kind of as it comes up. And I do have a committee or a board that kinda watchdogs this area, but there is no formal program of any sort overall. There are formal bits of programs, like the Institute of European Studies.

In other areas, I think I've mentioned earlier the work of the Honors Board and the Environmental Studies Board and the Hydrology Board in developing for a small institution kinds of educational experiences on an interdisciplinary basis, that in my opinion maximizes the resources we have here so we can capitalize on the strength of the three or four people in a given area who may not be in the same department, but yet can deal with a topic in a good way. So in some cases we've formalize some of these interdepartmental things.

This is the long way around to talking about schools and colleges I know, but I

think it does have some bearing on one of the new developments, and that is on the development of the medical school. Part of what I had hoped would come from the medical school, and it is indeed coming that way, is that it could be a kind of spearhead for boosting work at this University in the health and health related sciences. And I think it's working out that way. It's still perhaps too early to tell how successfully, but we do have at least some courses now that are taught under the aegis of members of the faculty of the School of Nursing or the medical school or some of the departments in Arts and Science that had been specially designed to meet the needs of a wide range of students whose career goals may differ, but whose particular narrow or short term goals may overlap considerably. And a case in point, just to explain this, is a course in human anatomy which can serve the purposes, with maybe some minor differences, of a premed student, with maybe more significant differences of a first year medical student, of a student whose interest is in biology, a student in nursing. Basically a single course can get at this kind of thing.

I think I will not get involved at this point in the political problems about the medical school which I'd like to deal with later, but just to mention that the dual kind of function here of seeing the necessity for a separate administrative unit, a departmentalized thing, to train medical students in the first two years of medicine, can at the same [time] have an interdepartmental spin-off that I think can benefit the whole university. So that all along in working on the medical school creation and on its development, our thinking has been more than the twenty-four or forty-eight or however many students we'd take in medicine, but it's been really the several hundreds of students also, who could benefit by having the resources on campus that a medical school

would make possible. So that's one kind of thing to say about organization.

In relation to schools and colleges on the campus, there're a couple others that I think deserve some passing mention. One is the relationship between the College of Engineering and Mackay School of Mines. This relationship has a history which predates me by several years, so I'm not really too knowledgeable about the early history of it, but there had been discussion, maybe four or five years before I came here, about the possibility of merging Mines and Engineering into a single administrative unit on campus, and the Board of Regents' action at that time was that this would be considered or looked at on the occasion of the retirement of Dean Scheid from the deanship of the Mackay School of Mines.

As his retirement approached, we did follow that mandate of the board to give consideration to this possibility. The board had not—back then—made the decision. I think this is often misunderstood: [not] that it *would* happen on his retirement, but it simply had recommended that it be considered and looked at on his retirement. So during his last active year—last year—I met on several occasions with the faculty of the School of Mines and asked them to do a kind of self-study of their present status and a study of where they would like to be, in the future and what kinds of changes they saw in the general area of education in the earth sciences and mineral education.

I also conferred with, or wrote to people that are knowledgeable in this area and sought their opinion about whether or not Mines and Engineering should be merged or kept as separate entities. This study was going along quite well, I think and pretty much on the kind of schedule I had hoped for, when the issue was kind of precipitated in a Board of Regents'

meeting last year. I think I was simply giving them a progress report on what I was doing in relationship to this. And this, I think, was being done in connection with the vacancy in the deanship in the College of Engineering because of Jim Anderson moving to the vice presidency. And I explained to the board that we were moving ahead on the search for a dean but doing it rather slowly until we had reached a decision or recommendation to the board on whether these two should remain separate or become combined in some fashion. They took the ball at that point, and we had a discussion about my thinking up to that point, and at that stage, my original feeling about this was that probably the best approach was merger. Maybe keep the Mackay name identity, which seemed to me to be an important consideration, by making the School of Mines a subordinate unit, but to the College of Engineering, much in the fashion that the School of Home Economics is to the College of Agriculture, but with a reduction in the kind of administrative personnel and operating expenses and so on that would be necessary, and indeed eliminating eventually, some overlap in faculty and a variety of other things. But as I got deeper into talking with people and reading everything I could find about the mineral industry and the enormous problem facing this earth with respect to a finite time limit at some point about the availability of nonrenewable resources, and particularly the very near crisis—near in point of time—in terms of energy, in terms of petroleum and coal and so on, to mining. It seemed to me, and is the long way of getting to this, I began to think that perhaps rather than subordination and merger and downplaying, that given a somewhat different approach to earth sciences and to problems in the mineral industry, that this might indeed become a very important new

kind of activity for the University. And I explained this to the board, that this was my thinking presently, that we should be living more attention to—we should continue the traditional kinds of things between mining engineers and geologists, but that we should refocus on problems of mineral economics, of the impact of the mineral industry on national and international relationships, on problems of ecology, on problems of reusing resources, and the development of technology for this kind of thing, and that if we could get this kind of approach in curriculum and with the right kind of people, my thinking was that maybe this would be a very exciting kind of new activity at the University. And at that meeting, the board passed a motion that the two remain separate. So the decision was made perhaps prematurely, but I think it was the decision that I would have recommended to them, I think, in a matter of a few months anyway.

And I do believe that if we can get the right kind of leadership and the right kind of curriculum development with this leadership, that we can have something that will be in the forefront, not just there or trailing along behind the industry. And I think a very important contribution can be made through this kind of approach, not just to mining engineers or geologists but could have a spin-off, I think, in much of what we do at the University and other areas, too. So the decision now is to keep them as separate entities, and that's the way we're proceeding at this point.

There was a great deal of public interest in this issue on the separation or the merger of Mines and Engineering as a possibility. And I received literally dozens of letters a week for, oh, three or four months, from people in the industry, from people at other institutions where this kind of thing had taken place,

advising against this kind of merger, and from just general citizens. I was really quite surprised at the strong emotional feeling that existed on this matter. Objectively, it seemed to me what we should be concerned about was just accomplishing an objective of training people in an industry that's still important in this state. I think it's, next to tourism, still the biggest thing in the state, bigger than agriculture. So we have a kind of state obligation to do that. But I was really looking for (if we went on the old way) the most efficient way to do it. But a lot of citizens in this state seem to feel that the only way to do this was to retain a school of mines, period. I think, from what they've said and my own conclusions, that the combination of two things: one, the history of this state and its heavy involvement with mining over the years, including the present, mining's still big; and the Mackay name associated with the School of Mines. Both these, I think, excited a kind of emotionalism that surprised me somewhat. Despite that, I think if I had not the other kind of conclusion for other reasons, I don't think those are sufficient reasons to want to keep an operation that is an expensive operation now. But there was a great deal of public interest, and indeed I think the action of the Board of Regents prior to receiving the formal recommendation, kind of quick action, is a sign of this kind of public interest in this matter.

Do you have any plans to channel that interest after the new leadership is installed?

I've kept a very careful file [smiles] of the correspondence I received, especially from the mining industry, and I do plan, when a dean is appointed, to work with him in recontacting these people. I've written to all of them at the time, but now would like to ask them to help us do what I—financially help us,

and psychologically—what I think we can do in mining. So the answer is, *you bet* [laughs].

The Agriculture-Home Economics, just very briefly—the association here is the traditional one, Home Economics being a part of the College of Agriculture. Historically, this is the way most of them have grown. But Agriculture and Home Economics both have changed so radically in the last two or three generations, that the rural tie that kept them together, the homemaking-farming-ranching kind of combination, no longer is of major consequence at least, so they've gone their separate ways, pretty well. So we're presently discussing the possibility of separating these functions. This is occurring in other institutions around the country, and I think it may be a direction we will want to take. It's under study now and the Home Economics faculty and the dean of the College of Agriculture agree in principle that this is the right direction. But there are a great many logistics problems to work out, if this is indeed the way we go, having to do with representation in the state through county agents and some merger of programs held over from past years and so on.

I think this would be an appropriate recognition of the changing programs that are offered in instruction and in the state. They no longer concentrate on the rural family and how it functions. Much of it is on highly sophisticated matters, on child care and in an urban setting. In agriculture, the shift toward renewable resources, their whole pattern [has] changed considerably.

One other matter that I might mention briefly is consideration about the size and diversity of the College of Arts and Science. The Board of Regents has expressed interest in this. I think primarily because when the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, organized into colleges, they did not create a broad

college of arts and science, but rather a College of Fine Arts, one in the sciences, and another in the humanities and social sciences. This has been of concern not only to the Board, but to the faculty of the College of Arts and Science. They've considered this on many occasions.

In the seven and a half years I've been here, there have been at least two study committees in that college on this. The conclusion the college reached every time is that, right now at least, it's better to keep the college intact. To create a college of fine arts, for example, would result in both a unit that would be relatively small and also one that, by that kind of definition, would tend to become more professional in orientation than our present faculty, at least, wants it to be. There is, I think, considerable feeling that a college of arts and science just by its existence does something intangible to keep a liberal arts thrust at the University, and that's pretty much my feeling too. I think that we might lose something—at least with our size—if we tried to break this into two or three smaller units. I think the thing we might lose most would be a remembrance of things past, perhaps, but nonetheless an important thing, the freedom of the student to roam within a college, intellectually, and acquire what's left of a liberal arts kind of background. Otherwise, we begin creating barriers that may not be big, but nonetheless are real sometimes to students. So a music student would end up staying within that unit with very little of the sciences or the humanities or social sciences. So I think most people are satisfied at the present to continue struggling with this rather large—very large—college and very diverse college. I think the effort is worth the kind of benefits that many of us feel we'll get.

Do you get the kind of public feedback on the Agriculture and Home Ec and College of Arts

and Science that you got from the Mines and Engineering?

No. The Agriculture-Home Economics thing really isn't that public. Not that we're trying to keep it secret, but our discussions have kind of been in-house discussions, and there hasn't been much talk about it. The other has been public, and before the Board of Regents, but surprising little feedback on that, which, I think, confirms the feeling that it's the history of mining and the Mackay name that are important ingredients in the reaction I got on the other.

I don't think there is presently or has been in the last five or six years any other major reorganization matters under discussion dealing with academic units on campus. The only other one, I suppose, is the athletic department.

I guess one of the most interesting experiences I've had since I've been here is the medical school, and maybe we can talk about it for a little bit.

A whole lot of this is a matter of public record, and I don't see any point in reading into the proceedings the testimony given at the senate and the assembly, and this sort of thing. So this'll be just kind of a personal field trip into that part of history.

When I first came here, there was some glimmerings of interest in a medical school. Dr. Fred Anderson, Board of Regents I recall several in-passing kinds of conversations with him about someday this being something that we should do at this University. Sometime during the first year I was here, I met and got to know Dr. Wesley Hall who was outspoken and vigorous and vehement back in those days, about, "Let's do it and let's do it right now." His comments carried some weight because at that time he was chairman of the

board of trustees of the American Medical Association, which in many ways is the most important position in that organization, even more important than the post he held later as president of the association. So when he talked, as he frequently did, about great help from the American Medical Association, and enlisting a lot of people to assist us, you had to take it seriously, you know, something that he could produce on. And some of the other doctors in town had expressed an interest, but again a kind of cautious “some day” interest in a medical school.

The DRI had a unit in operation when I came here called the Laboratory for Environmental Pathophysiology, and the person in charge of it—and I think he came about the time I did; my knowledge of appointments in DRI is fuzzy enough so I’m not sure—it was Dr. George Smith, an M. D. who came here from the Boston area. He had accumulated a small staff of people who were doing work on, oh, the pacemaker kind of thing, using sheep as experimental animals, doing some work, as I understand, with Frits Went about what as a layman I would call air pollutants and the effect on the respiratory systems of animals, and so on.

It was not a big operation; it occupied a Quonset hut at the Washoe Medical Center. But it was a beginning of sorts in medical or semi medical research activities. The University already had approved Ph.D. programs in biology and chemistry and a strong undergraduate program in animal science in the College of Agriculture. So there were a lot of threads that kind of fit the pattern of cloth that would develop, or could develop into a medical school.

Then, I think the thing that precipitated this more than anything else was the decision by the voters in this county. And that was to assume bonding for a massive addition to

the Washoe Medical Center, the local county hospital. Well, almost immediately then, the people who were interested in the medical school suggested we consider whether this might be the time then, in conjunction with the Washoe Medical Center in their new building, to look at the possibility of a medical school, with the notion being that this new facility might have in it teaching spaces. It would involve a larger staff, and perhaps these could be part of a medical school operation, and so on.

Dr. Anderson then became really quite interested; he had been interested, but *quite* interested in terms of speeding up the time schedule on this considerably. And we began working then with George Smith and two other faculty members, Dean Fletcher, who was chairman of the department of biochemistry, and with Dr. Richard Licata, who was an anatomist and who’d been brought to the campus in a strange kind of way, from my point of view, and given an appointment in the DRI as professor of anatomy and chairman of the department of anatomy. And this disconcerted me a great deal as you might guess. We had no department of anatomy and I had not been consulted at all, not just about his appointment, but about appointing anyone as a professor of anatomy.

But the fact is, he was here, with those titles. So the three, George Smith, Dick Licata and Dean Fletcher became the kind of on-the-ground working group to look into, in a very rough way, the feasibility of a medical school. And they did a very preliminary kind of study, in cooperation with the board of directors of the hospital, which was presented to the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents authorized further study on this, especially the development of a full scale feasibility study. But the action on the part of the Board

of Regents really kind of gave a green light to the discussion of the possible reality of a school of medicine on this campus.

The discussion in the board was an interesting one. This hadn't been brought to the board, really. There'd been some talk in the board about looking at this and looking at relationships with the Washoe Medical Center, but the topic as a real topic wasn't really scheduled for board discussion prior to the time when this action that I referred to took place. And I think there was a clear split on the board, a north-south split. Some of the regents from Las Vegas, I think felt that they'd been taken by surprise on this, (at least that's my impression) and that what had been done so far was really weighted very heavily with selected evidence in favor of both a medical school and in favor of its being in Reno rather than in Las Vegas.

The board took this action and it was—my dates are slipping me—must have been in the Spring of '67. The legislature was in session, and after the board, on a Saturday meeting, gave the green light to further study on this, several of us went back to Chicago for a meeting with the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association, [which] happened to be meeting in Chicago at that time. Dr. Anderson went, and Dr. Ernie Mack, I believe, chairman of the board of trustees of the Medical Center, George Smith and Dr. William O'Brien, an anesthesiologist in town who, like Dr. Hall, had been one of the early and vigorous supporters of the medical school. Dr. Hall was at the meeting in Chicago, and it was kind of by his invitation that we went. And we talked to several people, more or less informally without making a formal presentation, including some deans and administrators of new medical schools. The dean of the medical school at the University of California, Davis,

John Tupper, who had been a close friend of mine in Ann Arbor, was in about the second year of planning and building—they hadn't opened their school yet. But he was of great help to us in our discussions. He was at the meeting. It was people like this mostly that we talked to in more informal ways.

We came back from that meeting to find screaming headlines in the newspapers that the Nevada State senate had censured the Board of Regents for giving this green light on the medical school. And the censure—I believe the vote was either nine to eight or ten to seven, with seventeen members in those days in the senate. So the first thing that happened to us then, in the development of a medical school was to have on the record a negative vote by one of the funding agencies that we'd have to turn to, a very key group, the senate of the legislature.

So we began then the long and difficult political process; and the history of this medical school is more *political* history than a *scientific* history, by any way you look at it.

Meanwhile, we continued exploring funding possibilities, non-state funding. There was at least one trip to Washington that I went on, another trip to New York to talk with the people at the Commonwealth Fund, who had a record of supporting new medical schools. So these activities were going on, as was the development of a rather detailed feasibility study. But the interesting action was in Carson City, really, in trying to reverse a public vote of the senate, and that's not easy. The senate had hearings. We did get a resolution introduced in the senate which would authorize the detailed feasibility study, and that's all we were asking for in the first time around. So this gave the occasion for hearings on the whole issue of a medical school, and the first series of hearings were in the senate not just speaking from the floor,

but testifying against us, Mahlon Brown and Floyd Lamb in particular. They had also quietly imported for the hearings, two or three experts on medical education from other parts of the country to testify about the costs of operating a medical school.

Well, what we were unsuccessfully trying to say was that (a) we were talking only about a two-year school, and (b) we were, at that point in time, simply seeking permission to do a detailed feasibility study and that we would report back to the legislature before anything happened with a study.

There was a great deal of individual conversation with individual members of the senate, as you might guess. I think a couple of people were, in their own ways, kind of effective on this problem. One of them was Senator Slattery, who often embarrassed the University in many other ways, but this time was with us from the beginning on this issue. And while he was not a powerful political force like Mahlon Brown or Floyd Lamb, he nonetheless had some kind of influence with a couple of senators, John Fransway and Emerson Titlow. And he worked hard for us with these two people. We worked hard with these two people also, I might say, and with some others who had voted— and I'm sorry, I'd have to check the record—at any rate, there were one or two who were honestly undecided about this. A good case in point is Carl Dodge, who is a remarkably fine senator, in my opinion, anyway, and who very rarely rushes to conclusions without doing his homework thoroughly, and he wanted to hear the arguments for and against and to get as much information as he could. So in his case, this is the way we dealt with him in supplying him all the information we could.

At any rate, the first step was to overcome this, to make it possible to do the feasibility study to overcome this problem in the senate.

And this was done. This was prior to the extensive hearings in both the assembly and senate which followed later. But it was a matter of getting off the record this censure of the Board of Regents. And we were able to do that, simply got it away with a joint legislative resolution. It made no headway out of the senate, so, you know, it stayed there but it didn't amount to anything. And we were able, I think, by working with the assembly as well, to keep this, you know, as a kind of an emotional single reaction to the action by the Board of Regents and that's all it was.

Then as we moved along with the study and the time pressure was really quite great because the medical center, the Washoe Medical Center, was working on a very tight schedule about the kind of building they would build. And we were spending many hours with their architects and with their staff trying to see how we would fit into their plans. And so this is not only what precipitated it but what gave a great deal of urgency to making some quick decisions.

The Board of Regents agreed with the Washoe Medical Center Board of Trustees, and there was a joint agreement that we would move in this direction. And there was additional action by the Board of Regents [in] the direction of cooperation with the medical center, there was an additional action by the Board or Regents that the proceeds from some sale of land to the Highway Department, under the control of the College of Agriculture that about three hundred thousand dollars of this be used in support of building a building at that time, I thought, on the property by the Washoe Medical Center. So we would have the use of their facilities and then in that near vicinity, a medical school building also. So these two actions took place rather quickly in the board.

Then every time something happened, the opposition would, of course, make itself felt even more strongly. And the opposition began to mount. It was, I think, almost exclusively a north-south fight. The hearings were held in the assembly and the senate about the feasibility of a medical school. And again the technical question was whether or not we should do a full scale feasibility study with consultants, and so on. But this was viewed as opening the door. So hearings were held on this.

The medical community in Las Vegas (the doctors there) were much agitated and very strongly opposed to this. Key legislators, both in the assembly and the senate from Las Vegas, were very agitated, very much opposed to it. And in those days the balance of power, politically, rested with the small counties. It became very clear that we would not be able to change one single vote from Clark County. For political reasons they were locked into a vote. And I don't know whether any of them felt that there were other things that would make them favor this, but it would have been political suicide at the time to've taken any other position than a negative one on this medical school proposition.

They kept saying that it was not a north-south fight, that they really were not trying to get this for Las Vegas, but that it was premature to have a medical school in the state anyway. I found it kind of difficult to believe that it was not a question of where a medical school would go, and that it was truly a question of whether it would go at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas or at the University of Nevada, Reno. But they said that it was not that.

Some of the hearings were really quite bitter. Some of the doctors from Las Vegas—I recall one of the assembly hearings—made some rather strong and personal attacks on

Fred Anderson, George Smith—those two in particular. The members of the legislature from Clark County, a good many of them testified at these hearings.

I think it would be interesting if you could describe the one that meant the most to you.

Well, I've already mentioned in the senate that the Washoe County senators, to a person, were strongly with us. And Senator Slattery did help. I think he deserves that credit. And the two major opponents, the ones that gave us the greatest trouble, were Mahlon Brown and Floyd Lamb. In the assembly, it was really kind of the whole delegation from Las Vegas. It would be hard to single out, you know, one or two, because with a few exception[s] of some who were kind of quiet about it (like Frank Young, didn't take a very active part but he always voted against it), it was mostly the whole Las Vegas delegation in the assembly. One of the strong people for us in the assembly and that helped, too, in subsequent sessions. Tom Kean—I'm afraid I'll forget some of them. There were several of our delegation who were very actively working for us.

What about your contacts with the governor's office during this time?

The governor, after the opening round on this and after the first few months on it—and his staff really supported us and there's no question about it. Politically, it had to be done very delicately, but people like Bill Sinnott on the governor staff were really quite good in keeping us informed about things that were happening, and who had said what, and this sort of thing. The governor himself, I think, well, obviously was supportive, but without overtly creating a fissure in his party or in his

administration. And that's understandable. It was such a hot political, issue that he wouldn't have been wise really; he would have destroyed a lot of his effectiveness in many other things to've taken a hard stand on this, but I think we got all the support from him that we could reasonably expect. And if he had fought us, we would have been dead. Or if he had been simply quietly standing on the sidelines, I don't think it would have gone either.

Why was Dr. Hall not able to control the people from Las Vegas with all of his supposed power?

Dr. Hall is a very forthright person [laughs] and didn't hesitate to say many times things that were just inevitably going to irritate people down there like, "It will be fifty years before that university down there is ready for a medical school," referring to lack of graduate work in the sciences and so on, and like comments of that sort about the hospitals there. And this kind of statement from hint was just bound to irritate the University people and the professionals there too, particularly since Las Vegas—University at Las Vegas was, you know, a dear new toy to the professional people in that community. I think this is what turned them off from him.

The last two or three times we had public hearings on this, we had Dr. Hall present, but we did not schedule him for presentations in hearings because it often did us, in some ways, more harm than good. And I say that with great fondness for Wes Hall and great recognition of the important part he played in getting this started, but he's a forthright person and calls it like he sees it. And we were dealing with a very delicate political situation and it just seemed best not to make that kind of frontal attack, under these circumstances.

Well, at any rate, during this rather heated battle, Dr. Smith and a few others (and I don't know who the others were) put up some of their own money and ran an ad in, I believe, both Las Vegas newspapers, saying in the ad that we were talking about a two-year medical school and the costs of that were considerably different from a four-year school, and that with funds available in the neighborhood of two to three hundred thousand dollars, this could be a going concern in the state.

That ad became a very important matter. Apparently it was read by Howard Hughes, and at that time, the governor and Howard Hughes were having frequent telephone visitations and apparently discussed this medical school business. Mr. Hughes apparently had read the ad and then asked the governor something about it. And as a result, Mr. Hughes sent a telegram to the governor offering to pick up the deficit in operation of this medical school in an amount of two to three hundred thousand dollars a year for twenty years. I think this turned the tide. I think that with that kind of support, at a time when Howard Hughes was viewed as the best thing that had ever happened to the state, and that was a kind of feeling about him at the time, and great feeling that he would be here forever, and the offer was a genuine one and led eventually to a contract. I think this really made the difference and I think it's very important that Paul Laxalt be given an enormous amount of credit for this. And again it was the kind of thing where he was able to be very effective without coming out in a news conference taking a firm stand one way or the other on the medical school.

I also think George Smith deserves a lot of credit for the effective lobbying he did with individual legislators. All of us did, but I think George was very effective in working with them. And Fred Anderson probably

deserves more credit than anyone; it was kind of his baby in many ways, from way back. And he's a man who's held in very high regard by legislators, including those from Las Vegas, and given great respect by people, so what he said was listened to. Some of the attacks on him from some of the doctors in Las Vegas I think really backfired, because he is held in high regard. So this helped, too.

At any rate, the end result was a squeak-through. The vote in the senate was finally reversed and when this issue came up before them, the vote was then nine to eight in favor of the feasibility study for a two-year medical school. And in the assembly, the difference—I don't recall the exact vote, although this is a matter of record, but it was about a two-vote difference. So at the end of the session, we were given the official green light to move ahead with a full-scale feasibility study for a two-year medical school.

We began also following up right away, as you might guess, on the telegram to the governor from Mr. Hughes. That was an interesting little bit all in itself. Dan Walsh, who was with the attorney general's office assigned to the University as the University attorney from the attorney general's office, and I were the ones who were working on the problem of getting a signed contract from Mr. Hughes on this. And it was a fascinating [laughs] experience, in some respects like something out of a *B* movie.

Just a couple of instances, but there were several like this. At one point he and I were to see an attorney named Gray, who had just been moved to Las Vegas from Houston, as Mr. Hughes's top attorney at that time, since in disfavor. But at that time he had been moved up here where he had been working with the tool company in Houston. And we were given an address only, and had a devil of a time finding this address; finally found out that it

was part of a shopping center in Las Vegas, a number on a door in a shopping center. And we went to the shopping center and saw nothing that resembled an office for the top attorney for the Hughes organization, and finally found a door between an automatic laundromat and a Chinese restaurant [laughs], a door—had this number on it and that's all. And we timidly went in and down a corridor and once you got into the place it was clear where you were, very plush but well hidden.

We visited with Mr. Gray and presented him with a draft of a contract and did a lot of talking with him, were there I guess a couple of hours on this occasion. He's the one that finally got it signed. Then after we got it signed, there were a couple of things in it that were not clear. There was a reference, for example, to construction of a building. We wanted the freedom either to remodel a building or build a new one, and we didn't want to be tied down to a single way to act. And there was also some misunderstanding between him and us about the date of opening the first class, which centered around an academic schedule. The contract would have left us with a June opening, and we wanted a September opening kind of thing. So we got a couple of corrections in the contract through him. All of this took much, much time, long periods of weeks and months, literally, between hearing from them, and then sudden calls and visits, another visit to Mr. Gray and in a very plush suite in one of the Strip hotels at—oh, something like three-thirty in the afternoon and he was in his pajamas grabbing sleep as he could between phone calls from Mr. Hughes and this sort of thing. It really had many humorous aspects as well, but it literally took a full year, I'm sure, to get the signed contract in hand. But we did get it.

Our relationship with Mr. Hughes, despite these delays and this sort of thing, has really

been very good. About a year and a half ago, after Mr. Hughes had left Nevada and there had been a shake-up in the Nevada organization for Hughes, the people that we'd been dealing with were in the Maheu group that were no longer the people in power in the Hughes organization, as far as Nevada was concerned at least, like that attorney that no longer was able to speak for Mr. Hughes. So we had, about a year and a half ago, some minor differences about whether or not we'd met the terms of the contract.

This came about because of our submitting to Mr. Hughes our request for our first check. We did this in accordance with the terms of the contract, requesting—the contract read between two hundred and three hundred thousand dollars to pick up a deficit. And our deficit was about \$298,000—it wasn't quite \$300,000. We submitted this to him and again heard nothing for a long time. This has been our pattern, long lapses between conversations.

We did then hear from Las Vegas attorney Jim Wadsworth, who came to Reno, visited with the chancellor, and came on campus and spent more than half a day looking at the medical school—our first class was in session then—talking to students, talking to faculty. Then we had some discussions with him about the terms of the contract, whether or not we had indeed met them, whether a two-year medical school was in fact a medical school. The contract did not specify two-year school.

After these discussions, we did reach an agreement that we had been in compliance with the contract. We did receive the first check for a flat \$300,000 a year ago in August or September, with discussion then of rewriting the contract so it would be clear in every respect and to restate it so that there would not be the necessity for submitting an annual report for deficit financing, but there

would be an outright grant of \$200,000 a year for whatever purpose we wanted to use it for. Now this meant less dollars, but considerable more freedom in the use of the money. This we agreed to, and we still are waiting for the [laughs] for the revised contract. But the second check, in accordance with this agreement, at least has been received, so there's no reason, I think, to fear that we're at the end of the line. I think it's simply a matter of getting the revision of the contract signed and—. It's a very strange group to work with, but all the people we've had contact with have been quite interested, and I think genuinely so, in the medical school and eager to be of assistance. If we could speed 'em up a little bit, it would help.

You don't get that impression from the newspapers.

That's really, I think, more a function of the way newspapers operate than anything else. And I don't think anyone's to blame. I'm not—on this one—not blaming the newspapers, but if we're told, and accept in good faith, that by such-and such a date the check will be there, and with the agreement of the Hughes people, we release this information, and then the check doesn't arrive, the newspapers quite understandably keep calling regularly, "When's it going to happen?" And the more they ask this, the more you say, "In a few days" the more it begins to sound like there's some major problem, when in fact it's just the slowness of operations.

The man who came with [Jim] Wadsworth who apparently came just—. Disagreements really were not major, but my opinion is—and that's all I can go on—that with the reshuffle of the Hughes organization in this state, they seemed to be taking a close look at everything that happened in the earlier days,

you know, no matter what it was, including the commitment to the medical school. From their point of view, they wanted to be sure that [laughs] there was a medical school, it *was* in operation that, you know, that we were meeting all the terms of the agreement. So in addition to Jim Wadsworth, another man came with him who really was enthusiastic about the University and had spent much of his business life in Spain, knew a lot about Basques, spent a couple of hours with our Basque collection, visiting with Jon Bilbao. and with...Bill Douglass. Wadsworth, too, is a very fine person to work with and really quite interested in the University and interested in the medical school. We've never run across the attitude of reluctance about it.

The change of guard in the Hughes organization made them come take a close look. I can understand this, you know; they wanted to be sure that they weren't supporting something that had faded away or that—. But, you know, they were looking at everything about the state, including us. But I think the kind of—I understand what you're saying about the outsider looking on. It does begin to appear that way. But I think it's simply a function of this slowness in getting things done. We've never talked to Mr. Hughes, of course, so I don't know how he feels, but he has committed a sizeable amount of money, well over four million dollars to this operation.

This is getting way off from the early history of the medical school, but it does follow through on the Hughes bit.

One of the other things that happened in the time of the debate was a pledge by [H. Edward] Ed Manville, a Reno resident, of a million dollars to the medical school as a predesignation from his trust, which means the money won't be available until his death and the death of his Sister until the trust is

dissolved, but it is earmarked for this school. And that, I think, is a sign—was at the time a significant factor in helping to swing the undecided vote, and is a most generous gift. Even though it's a delayed one, it's a remarkably fine gift from an individual.

We were also, during the time of the debate in the assembly and the senate, had been in discussion with the Commonwealth [Fund] people, and they were quite interested, particularly with the kind of innovative approach we were talking about, but would not make any statement of any commitments of funds or anything else until the political problem was resolved, and we ran into this attitude every place we turned. It still has some effect, although the basic political problem apparently has been resolved with public statements by some of the people like Floyd Lamb saying publicly that he has made a complete turnabout on his attitude on this. So I think the political problem is basically resolved, but the early problem lingers on with us on this.

I would like to mention a couple of other people in this history that—for the record—got their names in. One was the very first attempt at anything like a need study or a feasibility study. I had asked Dean Tom O'Brien to do [that study] and that, I guess, was the first piece of paper we had leading to small and large feasibility studies. So I think that should be in the history of it.

Another very important person on the Board of Regents in this was Procter Hug, Jr., who was strongly for this but quite properly questioning and raising the right kinds of questions so that it wasn't a kind of automatic signal response of yes, and I think he performed therefore a very useful function as a kind of pro skeptic in a sense on this. But he was, and he was for it and he spoke for it publicly on a good many occasions after he

had satisfied himself that this was something that was feasible.

Another regent who had a great deal of interest in this was Dr. Juanita White, whose attitude toward this I had great difficulty in fathoming many times, and who seemed to me at least to be alternately very much for it and very much against it, but who finally voted for the creation of the medical school. This took, I think, a good deal of courage as a regent from Las Vegas from Clark County. I think it reflected her interest in medical education, and so I think she deserves some mention in this history of the medical school.

At any rate the school was finally given all the necessary approvals by regents and by legislative action. The legislative action finally took the form of a very modest appropriation to the School of Medical Sciences, and this was the form of the approval, designated for some remodeling of a building on campus. I asked George Smith to be acting dean of the school once the school had been approved, and he began working with Dean Fletcher and Dick Licata, with members of the faculty in biology and in psychology, in chemistry and biochemistry, in the very initial planning stages of the school.

The concept from the beginning—and this is one thing we kept telling legislators and others—was to maximize the resources we presently had on campus, rather than starting an isolated kind of thing off by itself. So this was one of the factors that led—that along with some others, like the recent interest by medical educators in speeding up medical education of new approaches, new systems of study for medical students and so on—this whole interest, plus our own minimum kind of financial possibilities for medical school—led to ultimately, the creation of I think a very innovative kind of program and the development at the same time of an

allied program in the health sciences which even before the medical school opened, began serving several hundred students in the University and in more efficient ways than they had been served before. By this I mean the work of faculty from the School of Nursing, from biology and psychology and these other fields, in a kind of team approach in planning courses, and in fact in teaching courses, provided, I think, stronger courses for students interested in pre-medical, pre-dental, pre-veterinary science, work, as well as the students who had an interest in biology or nursing or any of the other fields that related to the human sciences or health sciences in any way. So simultaneous and maybe even a little bit ahead of the development of the medical school per se, was health sciences program.

During the planning years leading to the medical school opening and in the development of these health sciences programs, two people took leaves of absence from their regular assignments and because of funding we had from the Commonwealth Fund, were able to spend a year in the planning stages of the medical school. These two were the associate dean of Arts and Sciences, Harold Kirkpatrick, who brought to the study considerable knowledge about administration and ways of organizing for instruction, and the dean of the School of Nursing, Marjorie Elmore, who had become quite a specialist in curriculum development in the health sciences, especially in nursing, but more broadly. So these two people, together with George Smith and the other two men whose names live mentioned, became the planning team for the medical school and for further development of the health sciences program.

The planning period for new medical schools is usually from three to five years,

during which time curriculum is planned, faculty is hired, student applications are processed, and so on. In our case, hard planning time, discounting the time we were involved in political problems, from the approval of the school by the legislature, was slightly over two years, so it was a fast job. The first class began in the fall of 1971, thirty-two students. it was a really historic occasion. It's not often that a university of this size creates a new school. Just that in itself was an important consideration, especially one that had had such a trying ordeal in getting approval. There was a lot of fanfare about the opening of school, the first day of classes, and so on.

The program in the first year and a half of it, has continued to attract an enormous amount of national attention. It's really a very substantial amount of support, financial support. At this point in time, we have virtually no state money in the program, essentially one full time salary and that's about all, some equipment money and some operating money, but not much. So the funds from the Hughes money, and the fine initial grant which was the big shot-in-the-arm from the Commonwealth Fund, and then subsequent very large grants from Kellogg Foundation of something over half a million dollars (which incidentally was kind of a sign, really, of the attractiveness of this approach). The Kellogg Foundation—this was an unusual kind of grant for them; they don't normally give grants for medical education or health education kinds of programs. Commonwealth specializes in it, so that was fine, but the Kellogg grant was an unusual one, and almost unique in the history of the foundation. Subsequent federal grants for both program and building and library support and most recently, not yet announced, but well over a million dollars from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, both for the medical

school and for the health sciences program, most of it for the health sciences program. And a great many grants, smaller grants from foundations and companies, pharmaceutical companies and others.

All of these I mention because I think they're signs of the kind of attractive program that's been developed here. It is true that hardly a week goes by, still, without one or more visitors being on campus wanting to see what we're doing in this two-year school. And I think this is a fine tribute to the planning that went into it and to the kind of staff that Dean Smith has brought to the campus.

There's still a lot of problems, and my colleagues who are presidents of universities that have medical schools assure me that the problems will not diminish, but will increase as time goes on, that medical schools are very difficult to manage within the usual framework of the university, that because of the rather unique sets of problems, such things as any student-faculty ratio you talk about in any other field doesn't fit here. It has to be almost a one-to-one ratio. And the real fact of life that you cannot hire faculty members with M.D.'s with a salary structure that the rest of the University lives with. Their potential for income is just too great in private practice so that to attract them, you have to talk about salaries that are half as large again as the top salary you pay a fine professor in any other field. Well, I mention these as, you know, just the kind of obvious problems that come up.

I think we have a very strong operation already in a year and a half. There is no discussion and no thought at this time of changing this to a four-year school. We're not doing as some schools have done, like Arizona and New Mexico, or Hawaii, using the two-year school as a kind of short-term stepping stone to a four-year school.

I suppose that ultimately, as the state gets larger in population and more wealthy, and the demands for full four-year training will reappear, and at some point in time, the state will have a four-year school. Here I would assume building on the base we've started. But that's not in the picture for any near future. Our desire is to make this the best two-year school in the country, and I think we're well on the way to doing that, in a very short time. And it's something I think we can be proud of.

Just kind of parenthetically, one thing came up in this whole medical school thing internally that deserves some comment maybe. Maybe my comments have made it sound as if the University—whatever that is—was strongly for this all along. That certainly was true as far as I was concerned, and true as far as the people working closely with the project were concerned, but there was a great deal of faculty discontent with this whole business. I think a realization on the part of the faculty of some of the kinds of problems I've mentioned, about salary and about the enormous expense of running a medical school (because it is a very expensive operation), and a fear that moneys would be taken from other operations of the University in order to make this go. Some of that still exists, but I think has been largely dispelled by the great success that Dean Smith and his colleagues have had in getting private money. The fact that they're in business with, again, with virtually no state money. So nobody has been hurt, and in fact some related departments have been helped because funds have been available to pay some salaries, making it possible to increase size of staffs in some areas, and so on.

But it would not be fair to leave the impression that everybody around the University was waiting with bated breath for

the medical school to come into existence. A couple of signs of this that I think are kind of interesting—. During the time of the political debate about this, the University was visited by an accreditation team from the Northwest Association, not because of this, but because our ten-year cycle had come around again. One of the recommendations of the accreditation team to the University was that we really think hard before we go into this medical school operation, that that did not seem to be financially the right kind of move to make. So their kind of mild negative advice was one sign of this and I'm sure reflected both the team's opinion, and I'm sure also reflected a good deal of what they picked up on campus from conversations with faculty and administrators and students. The other kind of interesting sign was that the faculty senate called me on the carpet, in no uncertain terms, about the procedure that had been used. And they were right. The proposal for this new school was presented as an administrative Board of Regents thing, without prior consultation with the faculty senate or with any other groups like that. And I—they're right, you know, there should have been some discussions with the faculty representatives of the senate about the creation of any new school, because they're also right that the creation of any new school inevitably affects the whole rest of the University. They let me know that this was done improperly and I think that also is a sign of what I've said; that this was not universally viewed as the great, big happy event on the campus. Now I think it's a well accepted part of the University and presents no more internal squabble problems than any other unit does.

I think that that about says what I have to say about the medical school.

I was going to ask you about the library support for the medical school.

I don't know as much about that as I probably should, but I guess there were really three existing units on the campus that were really most closely involved with this. One was agriculture, the other was nursing, and the third unit would be the library. One of the prerequisites for accreditation and for doing the right kind of job in a medical school, as it is in any other educational endeavor, is an adequate library. The library was called on to assist both in advice (and that's cheap and easy to get) but also in funding and in space. We did get some, and continue to get, some federal funding for our medical library purposes, but there also, the library has had to make some contributions, both for book acquisition [and for] periodical acquisition. And while we have been able to help fund at least one position in the life sciences library, it still costs library money to do this. The physical solution was to combine this with the life sciences library in the College of Agriculture building, which, I think, has worked out on a temporary basis reasonably well. That's not going to last forever, though.

Just as an addendum to the faculty position to this, it seemed clear to me that there was a good deal of unhappiness, both with the medical school and with the way I proceeded on it, so in addition to the senate meeting, we had a full-scale faculty meeting in which I outlined the events leading to this, in which there was a good deal of discussion about procedure on this, none of which I could argue with. I did promise them, and I think I've stuck to this, that any further developments about this school would be taken to the appropriate body before decisions were made, and we've done that, not necessarily with the senate, but for example

on problems of salary levels, these have been discussed with the Academic Council, so that the other deans of other colleges who administer salary policy would at least be kept informed about it. So we have tried very hard since then to keep it in the right channel.

How about the participation of the doctors? Every so often there'll be a new list of adjunct professors or cooperating medical people. This indicates a certain amount of support in the community, and you might well talk about how that program evolved.

This is not only important in terms of support, but I think it also gets to one kind of innovative thing that the medical school has done, that we presently have over a hundred local doctors who are members of our clinical faculty, which is an adjunct faculty category, who contribute time and service in one way or another and in varying degrees to the operation of the medical school, all of these in this county. Then through-out the state there's some others that make contributions, some of whom are on our clinical faculty.

One of the things where the doctors participate most effectively, and one of the new approaches in this two-year school—traditionally medical education has been very rigidly divided into two parts, the first two years being pre-clinical years where students spend their time in the class room and laboratories and dissect cadavers and look in microscopes and they never see live human beings, or especially live sick human beings. One of the things that we're doing here is, the very first day, as a matter of fact prior to their first day of classes, everyone of our students is spending time with a local physician, in his office, in his home, making hospital rounds. And he continues this kind of relationship, not necessarily with the same person, but

he'll be with one doctor for several months, then with another for several months. The arrangement is, even during the school year, he spends about one full day a week, odd and assorted hours, with the physician, so that from the beginning he's seeing medicine in practice, and he's seeing sick people, so that the things he's learning in the laboratory begin to have some kind of transfer into what a doctor sees, what a trained M. D. sees. So the large number of doctors who are working with us not only make it possible to do a kind of interesting and, for a two-year school, new kind of thing, but I think it does indicate a great deal of support for the medical school.

I might say that we're getting the same kind of cooperation with a summer kind of externship program for our medical students. Some of them—oh, I think seven or eight of the twenty-four—spent this [time] in Las Vegas with doctors in Las Vegas this past summer, one or two of them out in the state (in Elko and other places), the rest of them here in town. So it's not just the local doctors. It's convenient to use them during the year, but doctors throughout the state are quite happy to help in this kind of educational program. And the large hospitals in the state, we now have affiliation agreements with all of them, including the two large hospitals in Las Vegas. So our students can get some externship kind of training in the hospital situations.

The cooperation—after the battle was over—with the medical community has really been quite good. I think the animosity as far as the medical community is concerned has virtually died down.

Do you get any feedback from the general public on this kind of program?

A few of them still think we shouldn't have a medical school, that it costs too much

money, and we're not big enough, and we'd be ahead to pay the money to send students out-of-state, and so on. That feeling is dying down, too. I think more and more, the acceptance of the medical school is gaining across the state. When people know about the kind of program we're doing they're really very enthusiastic about it. A lot of them don't know, but if you tell them just the kind of point I've made now about this close association with practicing physicians, that makes good sense to them. It's, well like, and I think it helps the medical school for them to know about this kind of thing.

Some of the other innovations are more technical and I think wouldn't be meaningful to a lay audience or group; such things as two semesters of gross human anatomy, dealing with the anatomy of the whole body as a separate subject. Our approach is to deal with human systems and we deal then not only with the anatomy of the head and throat, but you deal with the physiology and the pathology and—you know, whatever else applies, a kind of an area approach. That doesn't have much meaning generally speaking, but you know it is an innovative kind of approach to medical education, and it fits very well, really, with close association with the doctors, that a student knows something more than a little bit about anatomy, that he knows the physiology and anatomy and the pathology and—you know, you name it—at least about one part of patient so he can kind of see patients that have problems in that area. I think we're off to a good start on this program, despite the problems. And the problems will continue.

You know, most of the things I've said about support have been from large foundations and federal grants, and so on. There is also a great deal of support in small financial gifts: the giving program of the Alumni Association,

every list I see has a few small gifts for the medical school, and local doctors and doctors throughout the state who have given many thousands of dollars now in direct gifts to the medical school, and the cadaver program, which I think is in many ways even a more significant sign than the giving of dollars.

Most of the cadavers are either from Nevada or from northern California, in a kind of Reno service area. Many medical schools have great difficulty in getting an adequate supply of human cadavers, and that's not been a problem here at all. That's a special, emotional kind of support that perhaps has more meaning even than a gift of a thousand dollars, which incidentally was one of the reasons why I was very upset about the prank with the cadaver,* because these are— you know—it's not only the program, but these were local people. And it just isn't funny and it could not only damage the program. It's something done with great trauma by a family, you know, to see a member of the family on death, not given our traditional kind of treatment on death. This is an unusual kind of thing and, you know, I don't have any personal hang-ups about it or anything of the sort, but I know people do, and so I just hate to see this taken lightly. It's not a prank as far as I'm concerned. But I think it does indicate the willingness of families in the state and of people to will their bodies to the University for medical research purposes—teaching purposes—is a remarkably fine sign of support.

*In the fall of 1972, pranksters took a cadaver from the medical school and left it on campus.

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Among the early groups that I had contact [with] when I came here was the Wolfpack Boosters. Not the first day or the first week, or even the first month, but in those early months, the officers of this group, who had been officers for a good many years, and still are, sought me out and we had dinner together two or three times.

Athletics has had a checkered career at this University, and it's something that arouses a lot of intense heat in any discussion of it.

Well, I'll talk about the whole thing, rather than just the shift in the organization, which is minor, really. But that was one of the early things I heard about, was the—and from coaches too—that it [would] make sense to move athletics, as an operating unit of the University, out of the department of physical education and make it report directly to the president.

I resisted this an awfully long time and when it finally did take place, just last spring—well, in final effectiveness, this fall; I think the September meeting of the Board of Regents was the effective date of it—it was with- a

great many things in writing agreed to by a lot of people before this took place. And I might say that the pattern, in about ninety-plus percent of the colleges and universities across the country, is the pattern of athletics reporting directly to the president. So we're now in step with most of the other colleges and universities.

But the thing that I was concerned about was the development of a kind of professional athlete group on campus, and I wanted to be sure that our coaches, for example, remained teachers, that we have no full-time hundred percent coaches, that they all do a little teaching, and that we not isolate the students who participate in intercollegiate athletics in such a way that they become different from other students on campus (that happens anyway, but why aggravate it?), that broad general kinds of academic considerations that applied to any other teaching unit on the campus must apply here, too. Because it is after all a teaching kind of situation, highly specialized, but it is teaching. So these are some of the kinds of concerns that I had about separation.

It went through the extensive discussions for a solid two years, the last two years, and this is no exaggeration. It's been a very active topic for that time. The department of physical education has spent many hours on this problem, the coaches, who in an ad hoc fashion, represented a kind of intercollegiate athletic group, spent many hours on it, and the deans of the college of arts and science who were in office while this was talked about, spent time on it. And a lot of time was spent in this office working on this problem. And the final decision was to separate intercollegiate athletics out from physical education as an administrative unit, and the director of intercollegiate athletics reports directly to the president now. I'm not sure what I'm getting into with this, but [laughs] that's the way it is now and it's a recommendation which I made to the Board of Regents, but only after—in effect— a contract or a treaty or something between PE and athletics, about how this would operate. And it's spelled out in great detail and signed by the appropriate people and it— the more I think about it, the more it looks like something that should've been done on deck of the *Missouri* than in this office. But it does, I think, cover the kinds of things, at least on paper, that were my concerns. That is, it deals with problems, for example, broad University things that I mentioned, the problems of tenure and the availability of tenure to coaches and teachers, and to assignment to duties in teaching and to voting rights in terms of faculty senate and a variety of—almost anything you can think about is covered there.

The pressure from the public that made itself known on this, and this was the public interested in athletics in a favorable way—that's the only public I really heard from on this—this became a very important point and one that I heard about frequently, and much

urging that this be done. And that puzzles me a little bit because I'm not quite sure why. Maybe it's symbolic only; if that's the case, fine. If I've fallen into some kind of trap unwitting, that by doing this, skyrockets will explode or something I'm not aware of it, because I think life will go on much as it has except that I'll have one extra person reporting to this office [laughs]. I don't think it's going to change much the nature of the program, and I feel a little more secure because I'll have, as long as I'm here, a little more direct control over the kind of program we have. And that gets in now to the nature of our athletic program.

Part of that checkered career of this University with athletics was the immediate postwar—World War II—years, when the University of Nevada, in football, really went big-time, or as near big-time I suppose, [as] a small state school could. It began recruiting athletes (as Michigan and Michigan State does) from the Pennsylvania coal fields. A national recruiting program that brought into the state some very fine football players. And this was primarily in football that this kind of thing was happening, although some in basketball, too. And these were fine players. Many of them after leaving here went on to the pro ranks and some of them became stars as pro players. So they were people of real ability; and the recruiting was good.

And Nevada began scheduling teams that are not what I would categorize, at least, as in the top group of teams. They were not playing the Stanfords and the Big Ten schools, and so on. But they were scheduling the next level: the University of Wichita, the Santa Claras of that era, and so on, and with a good deal of success. I think in at least one year, they were rated in the top ten schools, not number one, but for a week or two they achieved this kind of national fame and were drawing good crowds. It was not unusual, I understand, for

a game against University of San Francisco to play in Kezar Stadium, to play before a full house—and, you know, one of the major stadiums in the country. This was attracting a lot of attention and [a] lot of people.

I wasn't here at the time, so it's all kind of hearsay, but a couple of things began happening, and a lot of private money was being raised to support this kind of activity because obviously, a university with an enrollment (at that time) of something between one and two thousand students was not getting the kind of state support that would maintain a program like this. So, many thousands of dollars were being raised in the community from private sources for athletics.

Then things began eroding this. The loss of a few key football games—and not necessarily very bad seasons, but a key game here and there—proved to be disappointing to some of the people who were supporting the program financially. But I think the thing that really hurt most was the real advent of pro football on the West Coast and television. And whereas Saturday afternoon in Kezar Stadium watching Nevada play San Francisco might have been the only kind of spectator sports outlet for a lot of people immediately after World War II, the San Francisco Forty-Niners got to be a better and better team and the people would go to Kezar Stadium, not to see two small universities play, but rather to watch the Forty-Niners play. And television began showing on a regular basis the pro games, and televising on Saturday afternoons that top group of college teams that I mentioned before.

So crowds fell off, and instead of a full house at Kezar Stadium, a couple of thousand people might show up. And income from gate receipts began to drop. And finally the University ended up in debt because of this football situation and abolished football as a competitive sport for a year. [They] then

gradually reentered in a very low-key basis through—I believe it was at that time that they, I think, rejoined—I think before they tried this fling as a big independent, they had belonged to the Far West Conference or whatever its predecessor had been, they reentered the Far West Conference or maybe reentered its football aspect.

I'm sorry, I don't know all that history of the conference affiliation. But they came back into the Far West Conference which in those days—it still is—was a relatively low-keyed conference with very strict rules about things like recruiting, no spring practice allowed, a whole variety of very restrictive measures in terms of football. As a matter of fact, Nevada was given special permission by the conference to do something that none of the other schools could do, and this is to help pay out-of-state tuition for football players because there simply were not enough high schools in the early fifties in the state to supply good recruiting grounds for athletes. So much of our recruiting was in California. But that was about the extent of aid to athletes that was permitted in the conference. And tennis teams and track meets and the whole thing, as well as football and basketball.

As time went by, however, the pressure began rebuilding, with respect primarily to the football situation. This is where it began at least. And it began—at least a good many of those who've been active in recent years in this were people who were students in the days of the "glory days", so-called, of the post World War II era, and I think were—are—really unaware of some of the problems that truly developed at that time. They remember going to the games or playing on the teams in those days. I think they're less aware of the disappearance of outside financial support and of—. The selective memory process that all of us have, you know, that crowds were big

and they forgot that they got smaller. To listen to some of them, you would think that Nevada was in those days playing successfully and winning most of the games against, oh, two or three times a year, against Notre Dame and Stanford and Southern California, you know, instead of Wichita and Santa Clara. The memory process, I think, functions in a strange way.

But these people now are the people who were young and active at the time when football was a big thing here, not the older crowd that got disillusioned. So the pressure from them has been quite great to move out of the Far West Conference so we'd have greater freedom in recruiting and in providing scholarship aid to athletes and in scheduling, to begin to schedule some other teams than Hayward and Chico and Sacramento State, and so on.

Contact was made with two or three conferences over this period of time, mostly of an informational sort, and I think truly that's basically what it was. Jake Lawlor, who was director of athletics, and who had been here during that whole history of the athletic program, was much less enthusiastic about going back to this poor memory of the great old days than many of the younger people. So I think genuinely he—you know, he was making contacts, but mostly just to find out whether they were interested and what kinds of rules they had. We talked, I know, to the Big Sky Conference, and this looked like it might have the right kind of schools in it, but when they found that up to a hundred free rides were provided for athletes in football alone, you know, at one of the schools, and legally within the conference, that kind of made us back away. And the distances with these schools from here was so great that it'd be very expensive team travel.

The West Coast Athletic Conference, which is the one we finally joined, is primarily a basketball conference and does not have

football as a conference sport. And this began to have some appeal to a lot of people for two reasons. One was that our recent history in basketball had been somewhat checkered. I think the '66-'67 school year, we won the Far West Conference in basketball undefeated and went into the quarter finals of the playoffs and had a great year. Since that high point, basketball fortunes got worse and worse every year. And so some attention then turned from football to basketball, that perhaps a way to revive good basketball would be to join a basketball conference. And the other aspect that I think appealed to a lot of people was that this would make us an independent in football and therefore free to schedule Notre Dame [laughs] three times a year or whatever else we wanted to.

This matter, whether or not we should join this conference, was discussed at great length by members of the athletic and PE staffs, who gathered a lot of information. It finally was presented to students in a referendum because this would open up for the first the possibility of our giving aid to athletes more than the fee waiver for out-of-state students. And this would mean, therefore, the need for more money in the athletic budget. So the students voted on both joining this conference and if we joined it, an increase in the student athletic fee from five dollars a semester, as I recall, to seven-fifty a semester. And surprisingly this—maybe I shouldn't be surprised; at the time this was a very much-talked-about topic on campus—but it did pass the students in a broad referendum, and they agree to underwrite it with the additional fee and voted in favor of the new conference. So we presented this to the Board of Regents and they approved our dropping out of the Far West Conference and moving to the West Coast Athletic Conference, which we did about three years ago, I think.

I supported this and one of the reasons was that there were two open positions in the West

Coast Athletic Conference, and they were quite willing, and eager as a matter of fact, to accept both Nevada universities into this conference. And it seemed to me, for a variety of reasons, it would be very good for the two universities to be in the same conference so that, for example, we would have the same rules to live by with respect to how we conducted our programs. And I think this is one of the things that appealed strongly to the Board of Regents, too, that we would have a membership in the same conference. For practical purposes, it applies only to basketball, though. Football is not a conference sport, although there is some talk of making it that.

Basketball, after we joined this high-powered basketball conference, became a disaster on this campus [laughs]. We were not ready for it really, and because it is one of the top basketball conferences in the country, and this led to a complete turn-about from winning all conference games a few short years ago to winning no conference games in the last couple years. And also to the hiring of a new basketball coach, presumably to bring this back up to [a] level where we can hold our heads up to this new conference.

I think the facts in the case seem to indicate that we are moving in the direction of more emphasis on athletics, but I hope the control on this is an awareness on the part of everyone that this isn't what's happening, that we're not doing it by secret design. For example, the vote of the students on whether or not we join a different conference which has more openness in it about the support of athletes, for example, seemed to me to be the right kind of thing to do, and I have very strong feelings about this. I want a good athletic program on campus. I want a broad range of sports, as I mentioned earlier, and opportunities for competition in these sports. I want to be able to schedule opponents that are at our level and not try to reach the level

of the other schools that some people think we should play, because I think we'd—you know, we shouldn't schedule so far above our heads we never win games. That's no good for anybody. So I am quite interested in the football scheduling process. I think so far it's been fine; I don't have any complaints. We're not overstretching ourselves.

Basketball is a conference problem; I don't look to our being champions this year, but I hope we can hold our heads up in this conference. I think we've gone about as far as I want to do in increased emphasis on athletics. It still is not enough, though, for many people.

Part of the problem that—not all of it, but one of the problems I have with one of our regents centers around athletics. Regent Morris is critical of me because I'm not in there seeking ways to raise a quarter of a million dollars a year of outside funds for athletics as they do in Las Vegas, and I'm not about to do that. I think the forty to fifty thousand dollars a year that the Boosters raise is about the right level for us. I think he would like to see a great deal more emphasis on athletics here. And I'm not willing to give a great deal more emphasis on it, and that is part of the problem that Regent Morris and I have with each other. I think he would agree to that, too, if he were here.

Recently, the faculty has become somewhat exercised over intercollegiate athletics. I wondered if you wanted to discuss their problem there?

Yes, the faculty and students both have been. Since the peaceful days when the students voted for an increased fee and for joining this new conference, there've been several kind of dissonant notes of one sort or another. And maybe I can mention two or three of these. One is women's athletics.

It's not just this conference, but the NCAA nationally is very much on record as opposed to women participating in men's sports events, and that's true of this conference, but that's not unusual. And in fact many women concerned with athletics are also against this, including the director of our women's athletics program here. It's not what she wants. It's only second best to have a woman tennis player on the men's tennis team. It's better to have our own gymnastics team, our own volley ball team, our own softball team, and so on.

About a year ago, the seven dollar and fifty-cent per semester student fee in support of athletics was divided so that fifty cents of that automatically went to women's athletics, and this has proved not to be enough. And the women's athletic group says this and I agree with them, that does not produce enough income to maintain a good strong program, nor do they have the advantages that the men have of an active Boosters club that can raise outside money for them, nor does the men's athletic program have enough free money to help them, although I think they're willing to, if they had more money. So there is a problem, and it's been a matter of some irritation on campus about inadequate status of women's athletics, and I agree that it is inadequate, you know. Once we have a program, we should do it. Again, we should do it the right way, and I don't think we're financially able to do it the right way at this point in time. And so this is a problem that I think has to be dealt with during this year and the next year.

That's one kind of irritation that's come out of the athletic thing. Another is a kind of a student turnabout, or at least leadership among the students on athletics. When Jim Hardesty was student body president, that was the year in which the new conference was entered, the student leadership was pro-athletics, not rabidly so, but they were

pro-athletics. Within a year, in Frankie Sue Del Papa's administration as student body president, the student leadership opinion did a complete about face. And Frankie Sue was not very much interested in athletics, but even more, her administrative assistant, Jon Wellinghoff, I think could be fairly interpreted as being anti-athletics, really, and proposed quite seriously, for example, that we put all the student fees into basketball only and, in effect, eliminate football as a sport on campus. I think this proposal was a serious one, but I think it was a reflection of an anti-athletic feeling as much as anything else. I think students this year are kinda—more temperate, but still mildly irritated about the athletic program. Part of the irritation stems out of the recommendation that I made to the Board of Regents that the disposition of the seven dollar and fifty-cent fee be removed from ASUN control. And that still rankles, understandably. The Intercollegiate Athletic Board is obligated to have a budget committee made up with equal numbers of students and faculty to make recommendations to me about the expenditure of funds in athletics, whereas previously, ASUN managed the whole seven-fifty. Although it was clearly earmarked by the Board of Regents to be for athletics, they nonetheless still had the control over it, and they no longer do. And I think that that still is an irritant.

My reason for making this recommendation, incidentally, was simply to get some stability into the program because so much energy was being wasted every year in constant, petty battles about line items in the budgets that the athletic department would present. It gave a perfect foil for the students to use to express their displeasure with athletics, and it took so much student time and staff time that—and nothing really changed because the money was earmarked by the Board of Regents and, you know, it was

a kind of a game exercise that didn't seem very productive to me. That's my rationalization at least for proposing this.

But I think this has remained as a kind of an irritant, and the (I think changing) pattern of student interest has been a move away from interest in athletics, not just on this campus but across the country. The big Saturday afternoon game and the football hero and this kind of thing that has been a tradition in college life for many generations just isn't there any more. I'm glad it's not, you know. It's a kind of a superficial thing to have as a glory matter. But it isn't there, and that's a fact, and it's not there on this campus, just as it's not there on most campuses.

Students also have more control over their lives and the way they're spending their money, and I think they're questioning more and more, you know, "Why pay fifteen dollars a year for something that doesn't interest me that much, and that doesn't do very much for me," or as they see it for the University or the parts of the University. That's a generalization, but I think it's a trend at least, that has kept a kind of mild irritation going on for several years.

Another factor locally is that we've had such bad seasons that there hasn't been much to cheer for, both in football, and particularly in basketball. And there would be some change in this, I'm sure, that if we had consistently winning teams, I think our human reaction would be to feel a little better about it. But if you add all these problems to not even getting much wins—then I think this has led to the irritation.

So women and students and faculty too, I think, are reacting, not necessarily negatively with respect to the faculty, and maybe not even with students, but I think with more questioning. I don't think they accept as the norm, or without questioning as routine, that we have to do certain kinds of things in athletics. And I think it's such a questioning

kind of attitude. And the faculty senate last spring, set up a senate committee to look at the athletic program. I think the committee is constituted in a fair way. There are people on it who are quite interested in a good athletic program; there are some who are critics of it. The chairman of committee I think is a very fair and able person, John Marschall. So it's not an out-to-get-them committee but it is a committee that reflects faculty concern about, and questioning about, the athletic program.

One of the things that the faculty has been—one specific thing that they've been disturbed about is the recruiting practice, and it's the recruiting practice primarily as it happens to have hit black students in particular. There is a feeling that sometimes athletes are recruited because they're strong and big and good athletes, and [recruiters] promise things that can't be delivered, like, admission to the University. And instead, their kind of back-door admission through a two-year program had to be accommodated, and that as soon as their eligibility is over, they're, in effect, discarded; they're of no more use, and no one is concerned about whether or not they finish a degree. It's this kind of comment about recruiting, I think that's led to much of the faculty criticism, and in this connection, a lot of the public criticism about the athletic program; and there is a good deal of public criticism, too. I neglected to say that counterbalancing the Booster-type group, is a fairly, to me, surprisingly large segment of the general public (as I've made speeches around the state) who [believe that] we're doing too much in athletics and, "Why spend that money?" More than I thought there would be.

The problem that I'll talk about later with the BSU and the request for an office, as it happened, not *most*, but a good many of the BSU students involved in that were athletes, and there were some ripple-off effects, both in public attitudes and by the coaches about whether or not they

could play. And this sort of thing that I think has created some additional irritation in the community, both on campus and off campus about the athletic program. And a case earlier than that of Jesse Sattwhite—I think I’ve already talked about some, who was a football player. I think that also, you know, raised some questions about the athletics program.

Just to kind of sum it up, I think we’re at about the right place. I have no intention of trying to do anything more than we’re doing, except to get more funds for women’s athletics. I think that’s the place where our greatest need is right now. I certainly do not want to be big time, but I do want a respectable—anything we do here, I think should be done well, and if we’re doing athletics, I’d like it done well. But I don’t expect an MIT in every one of our science departments; I want a good science department, doing its own thing. I don’t want to try to copy Southern California or University of Michigan in athletics either, nor do I want to copy the University of Nevada at Las Vegas in athletics either.

With this faculty senate study going on, was there any particular rush through the Board of Regents to separate the departments? It was my understanding that one of the recommendations to come out of the faculty senate’s study was going to be whether the departments should be separated.

There really wasn’t. As I mentioned, this had been a good solid two years, much prior to the creation of the senate committee or the expression of concern made publicly first, I think, by Ken Carpenter. So there really is no connection. There’s no rush to do it; this was really quite independent. Because it had been going on so long, and because I have no idea how long the senate committee will be in operation, I didn’t feel I should wait another

year to make a decision on this matter. But there really is no connection at all in this.

Just a few final words about intercollegiate athletics. The basketball record had been going downhill rather steadily since the 1966 season, I guess. And there was considerable dissatisfaction with the kind of record that the basketball team had been accumulating, and some dissatisfaction with the coaching, both as it showed itself in the way the game came out, and also a good deal of faculty and student interest on campus with respect to the kind of recruiting that went into—especially basketball. This had been true earlier in football. But there had been, about three years ago, Dick Trachok left the coaching of the football team and Jerry Scattini, I think, had been making rather serious efforts to do some different kinds of recruiting with a greater emphasis on Nevada high school graduates, and on California players from the community colleges, primarily in California. And I think there had been some more careful recruiting for football to get students whose prospects for graduation were good, rather than prospects for football only. This takes time, of course, but I think there had been a change in this.

That wasn’t true in basketball and much of the recruiting in basketball was back in the Midwest where Jack Spencer, who was a native of Iowa, had gone to school and had many many contacts with Iowa high schools and with junior and community colleges, and in the Chicago area, and in the South, especially in Texas. And a lot of the recruiting was done, understandably, in the areas where he knew people. This led to some dissatisfaction, I think, on the part of faculty and students, primarily I think because the feeling was the recruiting this far away meant that no one really got to know these students very well and what their capabilities were, and it was more like dealing with scouting reports only on their skills as

basketball players. So that was a factor, too; I think a very important factor, as a matter of fact, perhaps even more than the win-loss record.

At any rate, Dick Trachok had, after a year between his coaching assignment—he spent a year teaching, and then he'd become director of athletics. And he decided, and I agreed, that we should recruit a new basketball coach. So this kind of recruiting went on, and we're in our first year now with a new coach. And I have no way of predicting what will happen. He came to us from the University of California at Berkeley and had a good record there in a major school, in a major school with a lot of problems, and has had good experience in working under hardship and in working with students from minority backgrounds.. And I think one of the things that appeals to me is that his recruiting will be in the northern California-Nevada areas primarily, and it's easier to make personal contacts this way.

There never was really a big hue and cry to get rid of Jack Spencer and hire Jim Padgett. Dissatisfaction, as I've indicated, but it wasn't the classic case of the coach being hung in effigy and this sort of thing. And part of it is because Jack Spencer is a good coach and is a very fine human being. So there wasn't a lot of pressure to fire him, but I think a kind of general satisfaction that the change was made and that, because of the rather high-powered basketball conference we're in, we have a new look in coaching in this area.

*You don't agree then with the statement made by the chairman of the intercollegiate athletic board who said that it was he who helped bring pressure to bear to get Spencer's resignation?**

If he did, he didn't do it with me. He may, you know, he may—it may be a true statement. Oh, there was some pressure; there has been for some time. Obviously you don't join a

high-powered conference and come up with two consecutive losing seasons without hearing about it. But it was not really the kind of intense pressure, at least from this office—now perhaps Jack felt it. Perhaps Dick Trachok; perhaps—I don't know, was it Tony Lesperance that you talked to? Perhaps he felt it. There was pressure, but not the kind of emotionalism that sometimes arises about football or basketball coaches.

I've never seen much of this personally. As an undergraduate at the University of Texas, I watched a coach being fired for a bad record, and a high-powered coach being brought in in football. But that's a kind of hazy recollection, and I wasn't in a position where I received any of the points of pressure, really, as they were brought to bear.

So there was some of this, but I didn't view it as—. Maybe another way to put this would be, I think if the decision had been made to stay with Jack Spencer, I think all of us would have survived. You know, it wasn't that big a thing. And we did consider this, that some changes in recruiting practices—yes—but maybe staying with Jack as a coach. So I honestly was not pressured to fire the basketball coach, and maybe Tony felt some of this pressure and maybe relayed it on to Dick, who was the chief person responsible.

I don't know. Athletics is having a rough time all over the country, and I don't think we're confronted with any unique or peculiar kinds of problems with it here. Even the big time schools are having problems. Students are revolting against support for athletics, automatic support for athletics and, you know, it's a pattern, I think of this college generation that we're all going through.

* Anthony L. Lesperance, Intercollegiate Athletic Board, University of Nevada, Reno, Oral History, 1971-72 p. 367.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF CAMPUS MINORITIES

There've been a good many frustrations [laughs], especially in dealing with the Board of Regents on a variety of things. Maybe this would be an opening into a little bit about ethnic studies and some of the kinds of things here.

One of the very strong interests I had had at the University of Michigan, and the last couple of years I was at Michigan I was really spending about two-thirds of my time on the development of special programs for minorities at the University of Michigan. We developed a scholarship program, and brought in for the first time at any major university a selected group of inner-city blacks and some Michigan Indians from the upper part of the state, supplied them with scholarships, with a tutorial program, as much of the kind of helping services as we could afford to do. And this program in the vice president's office there operated as my responsibility. Roger Heyns and I set up a relationship with Tuskegee Institute, the predominately black southern school in

Tuskegee, Alabama. He and I made the first trip to Tuskegee to talk to President Luther Foster and Vice President Russell Brown, who now is a member of our faculty here, about the possibilities of the University of Michigan working with Tuskegee Institute in faculty exchange, student exchange, using some of the University of Michigan's resources to help Tuskegee in a variety of ways. And in fact, it's a two way street, some things Tuskegee could do for the University of Michigan. Well, I won't—that's not the purpose of all this.

But the point is that the last couple of years at Michigan, increasingly I was involved in programs of this sort, and it's been a long time and a very strong personal feeling, or whatever, of mine about doing something in this area. As a matter of fact, I think one of the primary reasons that Nena and I stayed in Michigan rather than returning to the University of Texas when I left Texas to go to Michigan—I left with a leave of absence—but I think the reason we stayed was that we had two small children and, given the opportunity, would choose not to have them raised in

southern segregated schools and in segregated communities. Ann Arbor, in those days was a fairly well integrated city. It had been at the end of one of the underground railroads in the Civil War, and so there were a good many black families, and we chose an area of town to live in that had the most integrated school—I'm not a crusader in this, believe me, I'm not carrying banners, but it's a very important thing to me. So one of the things when I came here that I wanted to try to do was to get some programs started of this sort that would not duplicate what we were doing at Michigan (and that's no good for here), but that would be suited to whatever the problems are in this community. The most obvious thing to me when I first came—and I found this to be extremely difficult, and in fact very frustrating and has virtually gotten no place. The most obvious thing to an outsider coming in is the large number of Indians in this area who really could become a matter of, in a variety of ways, of interest on behalf of the University.

I talked to a good many University people about this and got very apathetic kinds of responses. I met a couple of times in the first two years I was here with the Inter Tribal Council to kind of offer whatever ways they felt would be useful in working with the University and in groups locally. Except for the programs in the College of Agriculture around the state that, in the last two or three years, have been orienting toward Indians considerably, there really wasn't—nor is there still—very much. And that still bothers me that we almost are at kind of awkward position of importing a minority population so we can have minorities to work with, in a way. And that's in terms of the kind of social role that an institution of higher education plays, I think that's partially justified. But in terms of a state university, it doesn't get at a

state problem that I think really needs our attention, too.

I think we ought to continue very strong, and we are doing some things better in this area, with some federally financed programs at the University, like Upward Bound and the Talent Search program, and the new special services for the disadvantage program. We are reaching more and more Indians, but still far from what we should do.

The number of black students on the campus when I came here was very small. I suspect there were less than twenty-five or so, nearly all of them athletes. There may have been one or two females, but not many. It seemed to me that the University simply wasn't doing its job in any way [with minorities]. Even if there aren't many blacks in this community, to have virtually no Indians on campus (our native minority population and problem population), no blacks, Chicanos, and Asian-Americans. The populations, not just in Reno, but in this area at that time in particular—in fact, any place in the state—simply were not big enough to—. I think the Chicano population has boomed in the last several years in southern Nevada; it wasn't great then, but the black population was quite large in southern Nevada then.

So most of the first couple of years was a kind of an assessment of what the situation was and what might be done. A golden opportunity presented itself in about the second or third year that I was here, and this was a very large bequest to the university' for scholarships for native Nevadans. And that's really the only prohibition on it. This is the Bob Davis scholarship money, and Bob Davis was a newspaperman and writer and had lived in northern Nevada; all his contacts had been here. My plea was that the will was written before there were two branches to the University. It should have all gone here, but I lost on that one, too.

The money, however, the income from the bequest to the University-Reno, is about seventy-five to eighty thousand dollars a year. I proposed to the Board of Regents that our share of this be used as a scholarship program for minorities, or for disadvantaged students. (I'll use the word *disadvantaged*; I'm well aware of all these semantic problems of what you call people from low socio-economic backgrounds and minorities and so on.) [I asked] that we set up a program of five-hundred-dollar-a-semester scholarships or grants, large enough so that it really makes possible a student attending. Not a hundred dollars a semester or something of the sort, that with piecing together other kinds of financial aid, like work-study was just beginning in those days, some of that, some other scholarship money, some federal Educational Opportunity grants, that we could piece together a financial package that would really make it possible for a student from a poor background to come to the University.

The regents reacted to this with—my feeling of their reaction was with, oh, kind of a lack of enthusiasm. And that's maybe unfair to them. What they finally did, at the meeting when this was talked about at some length, was to accept my proposal for fifty thousand dollars of the total amount, and then they created, at their initiative, two other scholarship programs with the remaining twenty-five thousand, one for juniors and seniors who have been working their way through college so that last year or two can be made easier for them, and the other a scholarship program [in] which they showed much greater foresight than at the time I thought; this was for women who wanted to return to college after being out for several years and starting a family and this sort of thing. So it turned out fine. They did

approve the fifty thousand dollars by a split vote. I got their approval to create a position as a director or coordinator of this program. We put state funds into his salary, and we hired, initially, three student-type help to do some tutoring and counseling. John West, a graduate student in psychology, was the first director of this program. This program was approved in the spring. We hired, John, and he spent a good deal of time in the spring and the summer visiting high schools and counselors and principals, recruiting for the program. So it became an active recruiting kind of thing for Nevadans. (I think I said earlier *native Nevadans*; they need not be native, but Nevadans.) And the principle we applied here was whether they qualified for in-state tuition. And he did recruit, the first year, about thirty-one or -two students; about twenty-two or -three of them were black, three or four were Indians, and one or two Caucasians from very poor backgrounds, and an Oriental, and a Chicano—miscellaneous kind of group. Since then, the program has been going every year with other people than John in charge of it.

I began all this sometime on the tape by referring to some frustrations about some things—and this one has been a frustrating one. At least three or four times a year, I get requests from some members of the Board of Regents for information about this program, and/or I get complaints about the program, or other ways of expressing a real distaste for the program for some reason and its very difficult to get any kind of special dispensation for this group of students. I tried and am still trying, as a matter of fact—am still in correspondence and conference with the chancellor on this—to get a special grade point average kind of freedom of movement for this group of students that other students won't have. For example, to permit them to

continue to receive the scholarship even if their—and it's a very simple kind of thing, it seems to me—if their overall grade point average is 2.0. Neil Humphrey argues, and the board has always argued for, not only must the overall be 2.0, but the previous semester must be at least 2.0, as kind of double proof that the student is making progress toward a degree. It's a minor kind of thing, but I think it's illustrative of the kind of problems that come up with a program of this sort. And it is very frustrating to try to do a very modest little program—you know this isn't a big thing—and not to give it a full chance to succeed, and give the students involved a full chance to succeed. And that is vitally important because we contribute money to come here, you know, we can support them financially, but if we can't give them a lot of academic and psychological help, we're doing a disservice to them, and not a service. And that's why I want to make the road as smooth as possible for them, and yet do it within the framework of the kind of standards we have at the University. This simple example of the GPA, you know, I interpret any student as making progress toward a degree if his overall grade point average is a 2.0, which is all that is required for a degree. But there are these roadblocks that come up. In this case, Neil is not arguing against the program. I don't think he is enthusiastic, but I don't think he is fighting the program. But it's the kind of thing that if I take a proposal to the Board of Regents (and this has broader implications than the Bob Davis program), and he argues against it, then there's no way I can get it for this group or any other group.

I think one of the things I was talking about was what seemed to me to be the natural minority group to be concerned with in this part of the state was American Indians, more so even than the blacks, who are less visible as

a minority group in the northern part of the state. For I don't know how long, but before I came here, the Board of Regents had had a special scholarship program for American Indians, and there were twenty scholarships available every year. The first year I was here, I checked on this and I think something like six or seven were being used, and that was the kind of high point, ever. The number finally kind of by itself grew to about twelve, I think, before we began actively trying to get Indian students in. And that came with the establishment of the Bob Davis scholarships, which not only was a scholarship money, but we had a staff for the first time concerned with both recruiting minorities and with some kind of academic and psychological support for them, as well as economic, when they were on campus. I think the first year of that Bob Davis scholarship money, we awarded maybe half a dozen Bob Davis scholarships to Indians, but we filled the quota of the twenty fee waiver scholarships.

I think the problems with the Indian student—as I see it, there were several problems—is the lag in motivating young people in the Indians. There was a greater lag than there was with the blacks. I think it's only now beginning to be fashionable to go on to college or to aspire to something other than the manual labor kind of thing, much as it had been a generation ago among blacks. I think now the motivation is increasing. But it seemed to me, and I'm certainly no expert on this, but it seemed to me that motivation—family motivation, and therefore the individual motivation—was quite low among Indian students, even those who were well qualified academically for the University.

And the other thing was, there seemed to me to be a lack of cohesion, more difficult for them to form into a group and therefore support each other. The blacks kind of

congregate together and mutually support each other in a variety of ways. Until the last couple years, an American Indian organization would exist only on paper really, that they were not organizationally minded. And not that that's good or bad, it makes a difference once they're in college in terms of having some peers who are concerned and who support them.

I think this lag in militancy between blacks and Indians— on a national scale—that the Indians seemed to be at a point where the blacks were six or seven years ago nationally. And as much as I deplore the BIA building incident,* I think it's— you know—the kind of thing in a broad sense that blacks were going through six or seven years ago. This may have the same kind of spin-off of making it readily apparent that there are open doors, maybe arrived at incorrectly by my standards, but nonetheless that it's possible to do some things.

But the motivational thing I think has been the biggest problem that we've had both in recruiting Indians and in keeping them here, keeping them through a degree program.

Did you have contact with the students, like Ed Johnson, who tried to organize this?

Frequent contact. Ed, I think, for the first time got an American Indian organization with more than something on paper. But it was small, and he had some problems in communication with the rest of the community, which, I think—you know—it was kind of greeted with great apathy, and that was unfortunate.

Karen Wells, who—she's a very bright, attractive, able young Indian, also is quite interested in this problem immediately so we snatched her up immediately as a part-

time counselor with John West to work with the Indians. She and Ed Johnson really were the two that, I think on this campus, kind of got things started in a small way. But apathy, both among the Indians and among the rest of the population in the University community, was overwhelming. They—very difficult to get attention. It may be because they weren't as militant as the blacks were, or as vocal as the blacks were, or as well recognized a cause nationally as the blacks were. I'm not sure why, but they didn't, and I think they still don't, have the attention or the concern that they both should have and that you would expect them to have within this community.

In addition to working with individual Indian students in the normal course of doing their academic work, we've tried some other kinds of things. We have offered some assistance through our College of Business Administration, and Engineering, for example, to Indians who are interested in small business operations, or small cottage-factory kinds of activities. And, as a matter of fact, while the Nevada Technical Institute was going on, during its last year or so, we were exploring vigorously the possibility of setting up a commercial glassblowing program designed almost exclusively for Indians in this area. And there were some prospective, pretty substantial support for this program. But the thing we ran against still was, the programs would be there and virtually no takers on them.

The Technical Institute tried very hard to bring in Indian students, and did bring in some. Some of the increased enrollment, I think, was due to what the Technical Institute was doing.

*In Washington, D. C.

I don't know; I assume the community colleges in Elko and here in particular are meeting some of that kind of need. I just don't know for certain. They should, certainly.

While we're on special programs, the most recent one of this sort, I suppose, is the concern about special programs for women. The kind of generalization about patterns on this is that it's much like the kinds of patterns that we've been through in other universities for minorities and other special groups of people. There hasn't really—you may not agree, but in my opinion, there hasn't been a very strong push on this campus for women's studies. There are a few women on the campus—on and off of campus—who've pushed hard for this, but it's not been the broad-based militancy kind of thing that some of the bigger universities have seen.

But there has been some interest in setting up one or more courses designed especially for women or about women. And as a matter of fact, in the spring semester of this current year [1973], there will be a special course in the political science department about women. And there is an active women's caucus on campus, and we've just completed (I'm happy to say)—before we were forced to do it by the federal government—an affirmative action program about the hiring of women and their work life on campus and so on. I suspect this will be something that will get more and more of our attention—all of the universities attention—in the next couple of years. But it's in a kind of beginning stages now.

There's really not a whole lot to say at this point in time, except that things are stirring, and up to a point, I think this is proper. I'm not quite as convinced personally that special studies programs, special courses, are as important here as might be for minorities, for example. No one hides the fact that Elizabeth

was queen of England as they might hide the fact that a black was active in the American Revolution—you know—I think women have got a better break, in terms of recognition at least, or at least prominent women have, than prominent members of minority groups have often received. But that's just my personal feeling. And if you quote me to the women's section of the daily [laughs] I'll—.

Why do you think it took so long for women to begin to stir around here? You said that this campus hadn't been under the kinds of pressures that other universities had been.

Well, you're a historian and I'm not a historian, but I think there may be at least one reason that's connected with Western history, that I think women, despite the cliché about the West being a man's world and all that, women have fared better in many respects in western states in terms of rights than they have in the East and the South, certainly in the South. Wasn't Wyoming the first state to permit women's suffrage, for example? I grew up in a state in the Southwest—western state I suppose—that had a woman governor. So in terms of political rights, at least, I think women have been better accepted in the West, and so, you know, it's no big thing, no new thing.

This may sound contradictory, but I think also the West is also very conservative and any of these movements nationally for equal rights or equal treatment or whatever, for blacks or for women or whatever, my impression is, get less favorable response in at least the Rocky Mountain West, if you exclude the West Coast, than in the East or the West Coast or the South, even.

Another one of the questions involved in affirmative action and these various demands

for so-called equal rights is the problem of quotas and what a quota would mean. Do you want to comment?

I think quotas are absurd for any of these groups, and it becomes particularly absurd, in my opinion, with respect to setting a quota based on population representation for women. I think this is unrealistic. And I don't say this as a male chauvinist, but at least the way our society is mostly organized these days, women, especially in the age group of twenty to forty, are simply not available enough for work positions to make it realistic to have a quota that represents the population. Women's lib or not, that is the kind of society we live in; those are the child bearing and rearing years for women and while there is a great deal—thank goodness—good deal more freedom about women—you know—moving out of the home during these years, it still is much more difficult for them to take on full-time jobs or jobs as their regular commitments. Quota systems in general, for males, females, blacks, whatever, rigidly applied, I think can lead to nothing to mediocrity. That's the wrong way to go about selecting members of a faculty or members of a secretarial staff or whatever. I think if we go strictly by quotas, the chances are very good that you end up with a mediocre group.

I say all this and it sounds much worse than I feel. I do believe that women have not been treated properly. I just don't believe in establishing a quota for hiring, or for representation in departments, or whatever else. That becomes very parochial, too, and limiting in many ways. I think we should make very strong efforts to bring more women into our faculty and I think we have tended to pass them by. It's a male's world, and it shouldn't be that much a male's world. I'm with the current movement, but not to the extreme.

Would you agree or disagree with the notion that a quota system is oppressive on those that it's supposed to help?

I think it is. I think this is most visible in the case of the minority quotas. It's oppressive in a whole lot of ways. It forces people into situations that they're not capable of handling often, and that can be, personally, as oppressive as anything I can think of. I think it has a potential, the quota system, of being bad for an institution and for the people involved, too. I would not have set up a commission on the status of women if I did not believe that we have some problems that need correcting, so I don't want to be misunderstood, now or a hundred years from now, [laughs] but I've also had very strong feelings, obviously, about forced quotas or forced action in unrealistic ways. And I think it is unrealistic to, in the case of minority groups to expect to have, overnight, a qualified group of people to draw from, the same thing in the case of women, too.

How strong is the pressure from the federal government to implement an affirmative action program?

Any university or college that gets federal money will have to have one within a year's time, period. But it's the kind of thing, we started ours before we knew this pressure was there. I think it's something we should do in both groups, and I think we've come up with two good documents. As a by product, it's going to save us some problems with the federal government. We're going to have them anyway, because the institutions that have tried very hard are still getting a lot of flack, and maybe the harder you try the more attention you draw to yourself. So I'm not naive enough to think we won't have any

problems with the federal government on this. But I'm also very happy that we didn't wait until we were forced to do this.

But we really do need more women faculty, I think we have fewer problems on the classified side and some of the technical kinds of things, like the library, for example. The women faculty we have are very good, and in a way, it's unfortunate, because it means that they've had to survive, I'm sure, long and continuing battles of competition with men. We should also be able to afford the luxury of some *average* women faculty. So we have some first-rate people and some of them have fared as well or better than male faculty. Eleanor Bushnell is a case in point, but it would be folly to argue from a single example, that we have no problems because we have a distinguished professor of political science and a former chairman of the department who is a woman. That's a fallacious pattern of argument. Our numbers just are not as many as they should be, and I think we should be working hard at getting more women faculty, but I refuse to set a quota [laughs] on how many more. And they should be qualified, but we again, should be able, as we have less than superb male faculty, we should also be able to have and tolerate less than superb female faculty. The same thing's true with blacks and although I think, in the last three or four years, we've done much better in this area, from zero representation now to six or seven professional members of our faculty this year who are black. So, you know, it's modest, but quite an advance nonetheless.

And again this has been a plea for blacks for a long time that we should—you know, they want the right also to have average people who are involved in the everyday affairs of human beings, that we shouldn't have the George Washington Carvers and the manual laborers only, that there are a lot of in-between

people. And I think they're right. I think the same thing's true with women. We shouldn't demand that they be the best in their field in order to be here. Not all of them are, but I think you get the point.

The University of Nevada's one of the few remaining— I think there may be only five or six public institutions left with a required ROTC program, and even though ours in sometimes described as semi-voluntary, there is an ROTC requirement for most male students. When I came here in '65, the requirement was for two years of ROTC for all entering male Students with some exceptions for physical disability, for students who'd had three years of ROTC in high school, and that sort of thing, [and] veterans were excused. But the typical male student was expected to take a required two years of ROTC.

There was some unhappiness with the requirement, obviously. Many of the male students and many of the women too, I think, felt this was an archaic requirement. Particularly with the men being faced with the prospect of the draft call, the two years' service wouldn't really help as far as military service was concerned. You'd have to go the full four years in ROTC and end up with a commission for it to make much difference in military life with, in those days, a rather strong draft

program that has since been considerably modified. But most male students faced the prospect of military service and the two years didn't help much. So the agitation was there to change to a voluntary program.

The ASUN took action supporting the change from compulsory to voluntary. And the proposal was as simple as that, to keep ROTC. There never was, during that time or subsequently, any strong anti-ROTC-unit-on-campus kind of feeling, as there in recent years has been on some campuses. Even the critics of the required part of the program that we have here among the students have never seriously suggested that ROTC be taken away, or that this opportunity not be offered at all here.. So the issue was not whether it should be here, but whether it should be voluntary or required.

The ASUN senate passed a resolution calling for a voluntary program during the 1966-67 school year and the faculty senate took the same kind of action with a resolution as a "Class A" action favoring voluntary ROTC. And that in turn called for a vote of the

faculty totally on this. The faculty vote—that is of all the faculty—was a strong majority in favor of a voluntary program.

This matter came to the Board of Regents, first in the June, 1967 meeting of the board. I was not here for that meeting—I think it was the only meeting I’ve missed since I’ve been here. Our daughter was graduating from Wellesley and we were back for her commencement. But I got a long distance phone call from President Armstrong, wanting a statement that he could present to the Board of Regents either favoring or opposed to the action of the faculty and the students about ROTC. So I dictated to Jean Baldwin a statement strongly supporting a voluntary ROTC, and supporting the action taken by the students and the faculty. I think, since I wasn’t at the meeting, I’m not quite sure what happened, but it really was not acted upon; it may have been simply postponed. My memory isn’t that good since I wasn’t there on it.

It was considered in the August meeting held in Reno and it attracted a good deal of interest, not big crowds attending the Regents’ meeting as in years that followed, but as I recall a group of students outside the Union building, where the meeting was being held, of maybe fifty or sixty students waiting for the action on the part of the Board of Regents on this. It was debated with presentation by students, presentation by faculty, and my support of the voluntary program. And then on the invitation of some members of the Board of Regents, a couple of townspeople were present speaking in favor of required ROTC. One that I recall was Colonel Tom Miller, who had been very active for many decades in American Legion matters and a well-known name in this state. I believe there were one or two others as well who spoke, but he spoke very strongly to the point in favor of a required program.

The vote was taken, and the vote with ten regents present was nine to one in favor of a required program. The one regent who voted in favor of the voluntary program was Molly Magee, and the students who were outside got the message. This was not the last item on the agenda, but at the conclusion of the regents’ meeting that afternoon, she was met by this delegation of students and presented a very large bouquet of red roses by the students—a considerably different kind of reaction to regents’ actions than showed up a couple of years later on other matters, but I think it did demonstrate a good deal of student interest.

Well, that was in the summer of 1967, I had recommended that as part of the voluntary [program], that a Military Affairs Board be appointed to concern itself with an evaluation of the ROTC program, with whatever activities the University should have— if any— with respect to the draft status of student or counseling of veterans, or a broad range of things where the University and the military might have some kind of connection. The one thing the board did approve was the creation of this committee, this board. So after the meeting, I referred to that board for further study the possibility somehow of modifying, a proposal to modify the two-year required ROTC program. And they worked on this for much of that academic year, and I believe it was the April meeting of the board—April ’68 this would be, I guess—when we came back to them with a presentation that is the plan we have now, developed by the Military Affairs Board. This called for students having one of four options to satisfy the military requirement. One of these already existed; that is to say, the three years of high school ROTC. A second option was that the University would work with the high schools in setting up a military course in the high schools. It would be an orientation

of military history, the foreign policy of the United States, the ways in which citizens give their military service and a variety of things of this sort. That option, incidentally, has never been implemented. Such a course has never appeared and I'm not sure that we tried very hard to get it into the schools.

The third option was the same kind of thing to be offered to entering male students here, but in a short period of time, originally two full days of lectures and discussions. And the student who completed this and passed an examination at the end of this two-day course, offered during orientation period at registration time, would be excused from any further ROTC requirement on campus. And the fourth option was one semester of ROTC, which was quite an improvement over the two full years.

This was rather heatedly debated. This time the meeting was in Las Vegas, when this came up, in an auditorium as I recall, and a very awkward kind of set up for a regents' meeting. The regents were on the stage about oh, three or four feet above the level of the floor below. And the officers of the University and others were down on the floor. So in making this presentation, the initial communication problem was serious enough, of talking at an angle up to the Board of Regents, physically, as they sat on the stage. We pushed very hard, and since the meeting was in Las Vegas, I did most of the talking, although Neil Humphrey supported this proposal we had as well. But I did most of the talking about the proposal. This was not a full board meeting.

My notes indicate that the first motion made on this was a motion to either continue with the status quo or to table this proposal. It had the effect, at any rate, of keeping the two-year requirement. The motion was made and seconded by two of the three Las Vegas regents, and the third vote in favor of

that motion was a Las Vegas regent, which has always seemed strange to me that with the great kind of provincial approach of the Las Vegas regents about *their* University and "you people up there" kind of thing, that they would take such an extraordinary interest in this program for this campus only. But Regents Ronzone and Tom Bell and Juanita White were strongly opposed to any change. Then a motion was introduced to approve the proposal. The regents' rules make it necessary for there to be five affirmative votes for a motion to pass, and this got four votes. And then there was much discussion and—there were seven regents present—and finally Regent White changed her vote and voted with them. So the program was adopted. The Military Affairs Board was continued in existence, and so I guess now we're at the end of stage two on ROTC.

I asked the Military Affairs Board to continue its consideration of the status of ROTC on the campus, and this they have done. In the school year of 1971-'72, in the spring, we brought forth again a proposal which had the support of the ASUN and the support of the faculty again once more calling for completely voluntary ROTC. There was much discussion of this and that got no place, by a decisive vote. I believe perhaps only two regents voted in favor of a voluntary ROTC.

Among the things that I complained about on this occasion, which I hadn't touched on much before, and because it was of growing concern to the students in particular, was the inequity of forcing a program, however desirable, on the students on one campus, and then not being the least bit concerned about the students on the other campus, or in this most recent time, the student at the community colleges. So we were singled out, in effect, for a required program that we didn't want but the other students on other

campuses were not asked to do anything. I suggested that at the very least, the two-day course was something in the realm of the possible; if this was such a fine thing to do, that any of the campuses, the three community colleges or Las Vegas, could have a course like that with no problem at all, and if it were so desirable for our students, it might well be desirable for them as well. The board asked that there be a study of the possibility of doing this at Las Vegas, and that's the only place. Some two or three months later, Vice President Baeppler responded to that at a board meeting by saying that they'd taken a poll of male students enrolled in the physical education courses at Las Vegas and they did not want ROTC, period.

This was not what the regents had asked, did not deal with the intensive course kind of thing, and that kind of poll is for—you know—the results are predictable. A similar poll taken here or any place else I'm sure, except perhaps at a private military school where the students are there because that's what they want, would have the same results. For some reason none of the regents took exception to this report, and the matter was left there.

As far as I'm concerned, it's not over yet and as I discussed as recently as two weeks ago with Joe Crowley, the present senate chairman, and with Rick Elmore, the ASUN president, the possibility—well, I asked them if they felt there was interest in these two groups, to keep pursuing this. They said yes. So I hope they will stir up the necessary kind of action again so we can bring this back to the Board of Regents. I don't want to do it this next month. That would be less than a year from the time of the last action on it, but perhaps late spring or early next fall, [I want to] try again.

Lest I sound as if I'm anti-ROTC, I strongly am not. I think it a fine program,

particularly with the kind of leadership we've had here and the kind of program that's been developed in recent years on this campus. With some changes that have taken place in ROTC nationally, it is becoming I think, a worthwhile kind of activity. It's more than in past years. I've served for the last year and a half or two years, on a national ROTC committee made up of a few representatives from associations of colleges and universities. And one of the recommendations that we've made to the Department of Defense is, I think, symbolic of our attitudes (and these are all university people) about ROTC and the changes, [is] that the name be changed; that it no longer is strictly a training program, the de-emphasis on drill and the greater emphasis on leadership—leadership with a wide definition of the word, not just on barking orders. I think it's, you know, it's becoming a program that fits a college community quite well. Much of the technical training kind of things are being moved to the summer camp where they belong, where they can be taught better. So that's by way of saying I'm not anti-ROTC.

I'm strongly for it, but I also am very strongly opposed to a compulsory ROTC program. I think it's not the way a university should operate, to require this kind of thing, particularly a university that's developed with fewer and fewer requirements of any kind. And to keep this as a requirement, rather than a good course in history or a good course in something else, you know if you have to have a requirement, this one's not the right one. It also is a discriminatory kind of thing. It means extra time in college, extra work for the male students that the female students do not have to do. There are a whole host of reasons why I think it should not be a required kind of course. So we'll try again. And hopefully, we will eventually join the enlightened group

of universities [laughs] that have voluntary program and yet a strong program of ROTC.

One interesting little side comment about the most recent dealings on the ROTC matter came up at the same time—or within a month or two—of a rather heated discussion that we had in the cabinet meeting and carried to the Board of Regents about the allocation of land grant funds. Some years ago, because of the Water Resources Act, it was to the advantage of the University of Nevada System for the whole System to be designated the Land Grant institution for the state of Nevada, and so there is in existence an attorney general's opinion which says that. That's an opinion only, as you know, but nonetheless, it's the one that we have to live with. That was in order to make it possible for DRI to get some federal funds, a good many years ago, in the '67-'68 period—roughly in that period. The fact is that the land grant functions in this state, no matter what the attorney general's opinion says, are exclusively on this campus. It's here that we have a College of Agriculture and all that goes with that, the mechanic arts in engineering and mining, and ROTC. And these are the three prime characteristics—the three most noticeable characteristics—of the land grant colleges. Well, suddenly last year, Congress made available additional land grant moneys, and we were having a horrible financial year on this campus. We needed the money badly. It was approximately \$110,000 additional money. At that time, we were suffering about a \$40,000 deficit here, so we desperately needed the money. The chancellor's proposal [was] that the extra \$110,000 be divided between the two campuses on the basis of the enrollment on the two campuses, and we had some lengthy discussions—President Zorn, of course, supported this—we had some lengthy and rather heated discussions in private and in the cabinet meeting and before

the Board of Regents. I was trying to make the point that since we had to carry the costs of doing the land grant things, and indeed there are costs of doing the land grant things, and indeed there are costs associated with having an ROTC program here, and a college of agriculture, it's not all fully funded by the federal government, that when this additional bonanza—so to speak—is made available, it should come here. Neil Humphrey's point was that the attorney general said we are all a land grant institution. At any rate, to my chagrin and frustration, the board not only didn't give us voluntary ROTC, but didn't give us all this money. We got only the share represented by our share of the total enrollment. That's just a side comment, but, I think, happened to come at about the same time.

If you might be able to interpret a little more what influenced the Board of Regents to go against everything on the Reno campus: were these handful of old military people so influential or so persuasive, that the regents would totally ignore all the rest of the information that they had?

I'm not sure that I know or that they would know, really, what all the factors are, but in the first round on this, not the action last year rejecting it, but the first two rounds on it, part of it no doubt I'm sure was the general national feeling about the war in Vietnam. And in those days, it was as patriotic a war as any war we've been in, you know. Those were the days when to speak about peace in Vietnam or withdrawing from Vietnam verged on treason, at least. Members of the faculty here who organized an end-the-war-in-Vietnam committee were severely criticized—you know, you didn't talk that way. So part of it, I'm sure, was a feeling that we were in a time of national military crisis, and

to take any negative action in some small way would disrupt the war in Vietnam, I suppose.

I think, without question, that not only the people who appeared and spoke, but veterans' organizations in the state, took very active positions on this, and newspaper editorials on this [were the same]. And that continued through all three of the steps that I've talked about, including as recently as last year. And I think the regents were influenced by what they saw as a kind of public opinion counterposed to the faculty-student position on this, and as often is the case, the vocal organized veterans' groups in particular were the ones they heard most from. I heard from them too, so I know what kind of pressures they were getting. They probably got more than I did because my stand on the matter was well known through the other times and I think they'd given up on me, but nonetheless, I heard from them. Resolutions were passed at state meetings of— I'd have to get my files out, but I'm confident that American Legion, VFW, all of the veterans' groups, DAV, had taken positions in favor of a required ROTC program at the University of Nevada, Reno. So that kind of public pressure was, in my opinion, very much a part of it.

Then two or three of the regents who were influential on the board kept saying that, "Well, I took ROTC here when I was a student, and it's served me well all my life. The things I learned in ROTC have been very important to me." And this, I think, had some impact on some of the other members of the board; I'm not sure. And there are probably a whole lot of minor things, too. The Las Vegas regents, I suspect, really didn't care very much one way or the other about a program on this campus, but in a way it's a useful way to kind of gig us, you know, that we're kind of stuck with it. I suspect also that some of the regents may have been influenced perhaps

by their interpretation of the kinds of people among students and faculty who supported a voluntary ROTC program, that the "liberal" students and faculty are the ones that have spoken out on this, and that's not the most popular group with some members of the Board of Regents.

But I really think probably the biggest single thing is the impact of individual veterans like Tom Miller and of the veterans' organizations* on the Board of Regents. They're elected officials and this is the segment of their constituencies that they heard from and loud and clear.

You know, another problem we had in the first two rounds on this was the professor of military science we had here, who was really doing some behind-my-back kind of politicking with regents about this. Earl Ralf, was, you know, actively working against the position the University was taking, and doing it in a way that I think was not appropriate. The last round, Colonel Hill came to see me before this matter was even on the agenda for the Board of Regents' meeting, and showed me a short statement that he'd planned to read to the regents, which was a temperate presentation. It was slightly pro-required ROTC, but not flagrantly so. For example, it said that many of the successful programs are voluntary programs, that he could work well with a voluntary program as well as a mandatory program. But his position ultimately was for a required program, but in my opinion, if I'd told him, "You stay away from the meeting," he would have stayed away. I don't believe in operating that way. If he has a position he wants to make known, then I think he should be there and make it

*See Thomas W. Miller papers, University of Nevada, Reno, Library

known; he's a professor at this University. So I encouraged him to do it. But what a world of difference in telling me what his position was, in fact showing me the document he was planning to read, than not saying anything, but going around my back on the program.

There were representatives of all the veterans' groups at the last round too, on this, as recently as a few months ago. Not as much speech-making about it, but they were there [laughs] to see what happened.

STUDENT LIFE AND STUDENT GOVERNMENT

I've been very impressed with the quality of the students on this campus, and I think only because I know them better. They really have very strong feelings about the quality of the generation—whatever a generation is—that we see in our colleges in these last few years and in the years to come. I think it's just a remarkable group of young people. They're so much better than my generation. They're brighter and more concerned about the world they live in and more compassionate about other people. They're better able to express themselves, sometimes in awkward and unseemly ways, but nonetheless they can and do express themselves. They're sometimes fuzzy about individual goals, but I think not fuzzy at all about the kinds of major societal goals that they want to achieve. Not just these students, but these young people, I think, are just a remarkable group of human beings that are in many ways very badly misunderstood. I think part of the misunderstanding is not because of anything special or new about the conflict of generations which is always there, but it's more apparent now and it's drawn to

the attention of both young and old, more vividly than in the past, primarily through television. And as I say, the young people express themselves, and we didn't do that in the thirties and forties. We may have felt the same way, but we either were not able to or not willing to be open and speak what we have to say. But they do now, and I think that leads to some kind of feeling that this is an unusually bad group of young people that are out to tear down society or—you know—apply whatever clichés you've heard most recently about this. But they're not at all. There's some bad ones in the group, but there're bad ones in any group. My generalization, I'll stick with in every way. I think this generalization probably comes closer to being fit for most individuals in the group than most generalizations do for individual instances.

The students here on this campus, I think, have had a kind of unusual situation to live through with respect to what's happening to their peers elsewhere. It may be much like what's happening at some of the other non-coastal western states. But the state is so

conservative and these young people come from this state—you know, by and large, seventy-five to eighty percent of them on our campus—so they're Nevadans and they know how their parents and neighbors back home feel (or here in Reno), and it's made it much more difficult for them, I think, to be participants in the "wave of the future" kind of thing that many other student bodies have been involved in. And I think sometimes they've felt this acutely, that they ought to be doing something like other college students, even if that may sometimes be the only motivation they've had. That fortunately has never led to any action, but I think there's been a kind of guilty feeling that, you know, "Why aren't we in the headlines, too?" Several years ago, I think that was the case.

They've had to overcome both their own inhibitions about, you know, they're conservative, and inhibitions that they've grown up with in their own neighborhoods about being themselves. And I think they do it reasonably well, and I think perhaps in more conservative ways than people in this state realize, and more slowly than people in this state realize, and more properly than the people in this state realize. We've not had any tragedies in this state of loss of human life or loss or destruction of buildings of this sort, and this doesn't surprise me in this state, although I've felt all along our students have had the same kinds of concerns about the problems of the world that the students in Madison, Wisconsin, or Columbia University have had. But I think they've chosen to express their concerns in ways that they subconsciously know will come closer to fitting the milieu in which they live, that they're smarter than we think they are. But even doing things conservatively and really quite establishment-oriented ways, they've come under an awful lot of criticism that's really unfair, in this state.

And it's a curious kind of criticism. Two years ago when the problems were enormous every place, and by our standards enormous here too, but mild as compared to other places, the thing that I heard most often was, "Those out-of-state radicals that are leading the kids on our campus." And they aren't; they weren't, you know. There were the Dan Teglias and the Dave Slemmons, who live in Sparks and Reno, who were the, quote, "radicals" on our campus. They weren't Bay Area radicals who came in to stir up trouble. Our own kids, and they weren't radicals. They weren't really doing things in radical ways, at least.

You shouldn't get me involved in a defense of this generation because I do think just generally that we can worry all we want to about the kind of society we live in; and it undoubtedly will be a different kind of society totally, fifty years from now, but it will be a good one, and it will be good because we have this kind of intelligence and this kind of concern in these young people. It'll change, but it's not going to change by an overnight revolution which brings on traumas that are so hard for society to deal with. I think we'll miss a lot of that trauma, and come out with something very good. And I think our kids will be a part of it, kids in this state, from this university.

That's really all, well, beside the point. At the University of Nevada, there's been as much a change in student-attitudes and behavior here as there has been elsewhere in the almost eight years I've been here. The student government, for example, in 1965 was a kind of a toy, really. You know, it was at most campuses, in 1965. That was a kind of transitional year. The Berkeley kind of thing was still new enough; it began just a year before in Free Speech Movement. I left the University of Michigan in 1965; the change was just beginning to take place there in 1965.

So it wasn't unusual. We weren't really lagging far behind. We weren't a backwater. But the concerns of student government in those days were matters that dealt with planning for homecoming and planning for queen contests, winter carnival. Elections were really a big thing, and Greek-Independent feelings were high. The most substantive issue the first summer I was here was, "How much money should be allocated to the debate squad from student fees?" And it was a real hot issue, Coffin and Keys were involved in it, and I'm sorry I don't know much about it because it was all too new to me. I didn't know what Coffin and Keys were and I didn't have the background on this, but it was a real hot issue in the summer of 1965.

In the fall of that year, you could count the radical students, relatively speaking, the number of them, I'm sure on the fingers of one hand or at the most two, just as you could walk across the campus and count on the fingers of one or two hands, the number of males with long hair or the number of girls with short skirts in those days. I often kid Ed Olsen that Perry Olsen, his son, was my pet radical. Perry and the Maxey girl, Belle Maxey, by the standards of 1965, were aberrations in a way from the usual student group, and were concerned about such things as stopping the war in Vietnam, which was almost a treasonous kind of attitude to have in 1965. And they used to spend frustrated hours in my office—frustrating to them—not because of our contact, but trying to think of ways to get something happening. And they were frustrated.

There was a committee which they were a part of—they left during the year, but were part of the beginnings of a committee to—can't recall its exact title, but a committee to end the war in Vietnam, something of that sort—who wanted to have the use of University facilities

for speakers and programs of one sort or another. A few faculty members were involved in this, Erlin Skorpen in the philosophy department was one of them; a more honest and dedicated human being I've never known. And, you know, they were not tryin' to upset society; they wanted to stop a war that—they were far ahead of the rest of society that was one we shouldn't be involved in. I permitted them to exist and use University facilities and set up a way of recognizing them as an official University group so they could officially use facilities on campus. Until Governor's Day [1970], I don't think anything caused as much stir as that. Regents were unhappy with me, and telephone calls and letters about doing this kind of thing, "What are we paying our taxes for?" and you know the kind of thing.

I started all this by saying the rest of the campus was really very quiet and kind of inward-looking, but that was true pretty much across the country. It was just beginning to change.

Mike Ingersoll was the student body president that first year and a very fine person, just a great young man. He and I became very close in a very short period of time. It's still almost impossible for me to talk about his death, which is a very tragic thing, an accident in attempting to make a parachute jump. He was a good leader to the young people and beginning to show some—I remember discussing with him at some length, some things that now are—. You know, he was a leader in the sense that he was kind of ahead of his time. He was concerned about student evaluation of faculty, for example (which in 1965 [laughs], on this campus, at least, was a kind of at least a liberal if not a radical notion), and ways of getting some student input into curriculum matters; you know, how relevant is the kind of program we're having? Very much a fraternity man and a big-man-on-campus type, but still with concerns of this sort.

So the stirrings were there, I think, of what was to come, in 1965.

Incidentally, I think I've been remarkably lucky in the kinds of student leadership we've had on this campus—not me— but I think all of us have been. In order to keep them in order, I jotted down their names so I wouldn't mix up the years. Mike Ingersoll was succeeded by his vice president, Bill Chaffin, who really, I think, never got with it in the sort time he had in the job. But you know, he never expected to do this, he wasn't prepared for it, and I think things kind of drifted after Mike's death, but a very nice person.

Dave Russell, who was the son of former Governor Russell, '66-'67 was student body president. I think back on it, you can see the kind of increased interest from Ingersoll and Chaffin to Dave Russell and the next year Ernie Maupin from Fallon. They began in Ernie Maupin's term, for example, a great deal of concern—to me, but not publicly—about what was happening in the Office of Student Affairs, that the kind of leadership in that office really was not with what was happening to students. It seemed to me this was happening in '65, but it really was bearing in on students, I think, as early as '66 or '67. And clearly, Ernie Maupin, I think, never talked to Sam Basta this way, but did to me, frequently.

And then suddenly, the next year, by an extremely close vote (you know, he won by six votes or something), we got a student body president who was a man of the times. This was Joe Bell, who was not a fraternity man, had been active as a student among other people, but he helped create the Center for Religion and Life the year or so before, very much interested in the rights of students and making the voice of students heard on campus—too far ahead of the students of the campus, really, and therefore less effective

than—. He discovered this himself about halfway through his term, and I used to talk to him about learning the art of the feasible as part of his political experience, and don't give up your principles, but find ways to do it slowly or find ways to do it that will bring your people along with you; that if you get too far ahead of them, you lose your effectiveness.. But I think he provided a jolt to the campus in many ways to the student, that was needed at that time, and I think made it respectable for them to do something more than be concerned about which fraternity was having a dance which weekend. They'd been concerned about it, but you know, it was respectable to talk about it and pound tables about it and to have debates about it and to express themselves.

And he was followed then by Jim Hardesty, who really aid many of the things that Joe Bell started, because Jim was a superb politician and knew how to get people to do things and was responsible. Joe kept plugging for a Student Bill of Rights, but withal a kind of flailing away at it. And Jim got it. You know, he was able to put in long hours, as he did, and draw drafts of this, and research out court cases, and a whole variety of things. And it happened during his administration. This kind of thing. A lot of topics were kind of thrown out and Joe's seeds were sown and Jim, I think, nurtured and harvested some of them and others began harvesting later. I think Jim is the one of this whole group that (I guess no one's going to read this for a long time) that I have felt closest to. I worked very closely with him and we have still a very, very close and strong relationship. I have great admiration for him. I think someday he will be governor of this state. If he isn't, it'll be the state's loss. He's a fine person.

Frankie Sue Del Papa, I think, had probably the greatest opportunity of any of

the presidents. The time was right, after Joe Bell and Jim Hardesty, to really move on a lot of things, but a couple of very unfortunate things happened. This is just my analysis. One is that during her first couple of weeks in office, the Governor's Day thing took place. She'd just been installed as president. And that was a very traumatic thing for her, and I think slowed down anything she wanted to do, at least for the rest of that spring and really carried into the next fall. And the other thing that happened to her and is that—in my opinion—I think she began relying too heavily on other people. First Bob Mayberry and then Jon Wellinghoff really took over and she was—you know—spending her time in the office and they were the ones speaking out on things and carrying on the kinds of duties that the student body president should have. She and I are extremely fond of each other and have been all along, but we had some basic differences. I think more differences with her than with anyone, and it grew mostly out of that. I used to fuss at her about, you know, doing her own thing and not turning her administration over to Jon Wellinghoff or, earlier, to Bob Mayberry. They're both capable, still are, able young men, but it was, you know, her bag to carry and not theirs. I think she felt frustrated most of the time while she was president, and I felt frustrated most of the time in working with her. We worked well together, but so much could have been done. I think both of us felt frustrated that it wasn't being done.

Dan Klaich [is] a fine person and I think kind of rode the tide last year, and had a good time, but was strong enough on at least one occasion to make himself heard—I think very effectively. The way in which he organized things in November of 1971, I think, was just remarkable. But there, you know, the apathy kind of thing was beginning to set in. I was

about to talk about the black students for a minute. The one crisis he had with the black students, I think he managed that quite well, too. He did the right kinds of things. He tried to buy time to work out a solution, and he tried very hard to work out a solution—you know—almost twenty-four hours a day, literally, for a whole week, and couldn't. He also followed through on it after it was all over, rather than washing his hands of it. He kept at the problem of the Black Student Union, and the result is that this year, as soon as the construction is finished, they will have an office. He reestablished himself before he left his term of office with the leadership in the Black Student Union as a person of integrity and one that they could trust. So I think he handled the crisis situations that came up, but other than that, he kind of rode the crest.

Rick Elmore is probably the best organized of all these people. He's conservative and reflects the conservative state, but like the rest of them, he's certainly not afraid of speaking his piece. And if you want testimony on that, I'm sure Dick Trachok would [laughs] give you ample testimony.

I think if I had to pick the most significant and noticeable change in the life of the University in the time I've been here, I think it would be in student government and rights, activities—all these things of students. And I'm delighted that is the most important thing that's happened, or the most obvious thing that's happened. I think it's clearly not unique to this campus, by any means. It's what's happening nationally, that students have become more vocal and more part of everything that happens in a university. But I still can't help being pleased that it's happened here, too. The student government of the era of 1965 was an innocuous kind of operation. I think I mentioned earlier that their concerns were largely social concerns.

And the kinds of changes in the importance that student government is viewed, I think, by the rest of the segments of the University community is part of this change in the lifestyle and the importance of students on campuses. There're several signs of this. An obvious one every month is the important role given to the ASUN president at the Board of Regents meeting, for example. He doesn't sit as a member of the Board, but he sits in a special place and his opinions are sought by the Board and truly listened to. It's not just a tokenism kind of thing. I mention that as a kind of symbol of the change in importance of students and their opinions in the life of the University.

There are a lot of ways to talk about the many dimensions of this. One, perhaps (while we're talking about student government), is to talk about the role of student government and about some of the other aspects of it. I think the student government can be important only if they want it to. But that's not enough. It's important—by they I mean students—but it's also important that other segments of the University want it to be important, too. It can be, I think, really stifled out of existence if it meets with so many barriers from faculty, administrators, regents, public, that it becomes such a frustrating kind of thing that it fades away or loses its importance. It has been taken seriously here, certainly by the administration, from the beginning—or at least since 1965. From this office at least, they've been urged to respond to problems at the University officially as student government, to become truly a spokesman for action at the University, and I think have been really quite successful at doing these things. Some notable kinds of successes are in the Student Bill of Rights, which had its genesis really in student government,—actually beginning with an interest in this on the part

of Ernie Maupin, continued very strongly by Joe Bell, and culminated really in the writing of a Student Bill of Right by Jim Hardesty. And maybe it's important to mention these three names and these three years because I think there's a misconception often that there's a total discontinuity in student government, that students are active in student government for one year and that's the end of it, and everything starts all over again the next year. Well, to some degree that's truer I think that is part of the picture. But it also is true that matters of importance to them do continue, that there is continuity, that they don't just die and get born again the next year. And I think that particular document was a fine example of about three years' work.

The same kind of thing could be said about some other things that students have been very active in, like the change in the academic calendar. This one has a very long history. I think Frankie Sue Del Papa was quite interested in this particular one, and began vocalizing her interest, I believe when she was a sophomore on campus. A year after she left the campus, graduated, it finally became a reality. It takes time, but there was the continuity all the way through. It didn't stop and then get started all over again. I think students are aware that they can accomplish things in some cases if they're patient enough to do it, and if they don't expect everything to happen in one year.

And from the standpoint of the life of the University, the knowledge that things can go on in student government for more than the administration of one set of officers, I think has helped give some credibility to student actions, that they tend to bind the next year's student. Right now, for example, we had a meeting in this office this morning about the proposed addition to the Union building. Student government of a couple years ago

took an action pledging increased student fees to finance the building of this construction. And it was interesting, this morning, Rick Elmore accepts this action of a couple of years before he became president as being *the* action of the students, and so do I. You know, we've been planning now for a couple of years on this basis.

I'm getting too far off on this, but I think it's an important thing to keep in mind that while there is not as much continuity as there is in administration or faculty, that the fact that problems can be dealt with over a relatively long period of time if necessary, is a reality in student government, too. And I think from the students' standpoint, I think it gives them a feeling of feasibility about tackling a very difficult and complex problem, that they don't need to feel that they're under a time pressure to get it solved like next month; that, you know, it can go on and on.

I don't have before [me], nor could I recall completely, a catalog of all the achievements of student government. I've mentioned just now a few of them. But I think they are manifold in the past few years. The alcoholic beverage policy I think is largely—not altogether, but largely—an achievement on the part of students. Much of what's happened in terms of the freedom of life of students, I think, can be attributed to student government. Not all of it; I think part of it is a social change that makes individuality more acceptable to all generations and makes the kinds of lifestyles that college and other young people have more acceptable. So it's partly a societal change. We were well ahead, you know, on this campus in some of these. Not the first, but in the forefront of the elimination of dormitory hours; this came very early in the game as far as what was happening nationally. The alcoholic beverage policy is still in the forefront as far as colleges and universities are

concerned. Coeducational dormitories—we were in the early group, not the first, by any means, but in that early group. So I think there are a lot of these things that deal with the rights of students as human beings that have happened here that are very important.

The *Sagebrush*—and others occasionally—is fond of quoting from student behavioral manuals of the mid-sixties, sixty-five, sixty-six, sixty-seven, about how girls should dress and how late they can stay out, and decorum in the dining commons and— well, actually a whole publication of rules and regulations, the violation of which was as serious as smoking pot is these days. It was that kind of atmosphere, one that I've never felt was the right kind of atmosphere, as far as students were concerned for a couple of reasons.

One is that by the time they get to us, they *are* adults and they do a lot of foolish and childish things, but so do forty year-olds, you know. They may do more because the taste of freedom is newer to them, but not as much as popular fancy thinks they do.

So, first of all, they are adults, and second, I've never been convinced that a good learning atmosphere—learning not just in the academic sense, but learning about people and so on—exists under a tight and rigid set of rules. I think the forcing of responsibility on people, of whatever age, is an important part of the learning process. And it's always seemed incongruous to me that universities, colleges, whose mission is learning and to create a learning atmosphere, should at the same time, in seventy-five percent of the person's available time per day, surround them with so many rules and regulations that they learn nothing except how to escape rules and regulations. And that's not the kind of responsibility I'm talking about.

So both because they are adults and because I think as young adults still learning

about life and about other people, as well as about English or history or whatever else, to give them this kind of responsibility (with nonetheless a lot of services to back them up if there are problems, counseling services and health services and other things that I think are proper kind of paternalistic things to provide), but let the decision-making be theirs. And I think this is the right kind of learning process.

You know, it's really a curious kind of phenomenon in our society that parents of two daughters (and parents worry more in this kind of situation about their daughters for some reason than they do their sons) will send one daughter, or allow one daughter when she graduates from high school, to go to a business college long enough to learn typing and shorthand or whatever they learn these days in business colleges, and feel very proud of the fact that now she's working in San Francisco, let's say, and sharing an apartment with another girl, at the age of nineteen or twenty, earning her own way. The next daughter that comes along chooses to go to the university instead, and we begin getting howls because she lives in a dormitory that doesn't have rigid hours, that we permit, under certain specified conditions, drinking to go on on campus—you name it. We permit speakers to come on campus that she shouldn't hear, while blissfully in San Francisco, the other girl at the same age is living a totally unsupervised life and more than likely is living in an apartment building not with a homogenous group of young people her own age, but with quite a mixture of unknown people and all kinds of tempting sins available to *her*. I don't understand this [laughs], but it is a fact of life. We still get this.

For some reason the university, which is the safest environment I can think of for a young person to come to, is expected to have

infinitely more rules and regulations and protections than any other environment. It's got built-in safe guards. The peer pressures are much greater, I think, than most adults believe. The mission of the occupation the students are in is not conducive to wild or aberrant kind of living, you know. It's a conformist kind of thing. [The] university, in *all* it's ways, is about as establishment-oriented as any institution in society. I really have always had great difficulty in understanding why the pressure for unusual rules and regulation in this environment and the great permissiveness, in my opinion, that exists outside this environment. Even with all the rules taken away, most of them taken away as we have here, it's still, I think, a more conservative kind of living situation than the other daughter off by herself in the big city. I got carried away with this!

Well, at any rate, what I was saying was, I think there are a lot of examples of the effectiveness of student government, and I don't want to attribute too much to them, because, to repeat, I think a lot of these changes are societal changes and a greater willingness on the part of the public generally, and parents in particular, to accept some of these changes.

Well, at any rate, I think one of the happiest things, as far as I'm concerned, and one of the things that I've taken great interest in, is the freedom and responsibility of students on campus. And while there have been frustrating times and some enormous disappointments in this, for me, by and large I think it's been a greatly satisfying kind of thing to see on this campus. If changes like this had not taken place, I don't think I could have stayed in this job, because I really have very strong feelings about the importance of these young people to what we're doing, and as part of this importance, making them

dignified human beings and not prisoners. So I think this is great.

Well, you talk about all these things that you are in favor of and that you have always been in favor of, and yet if you read the Sagebrush, or listen to the kids, you think that these decisions have come awfully hard, or that these changes in policies have come awfully hard, the coed dorms and the alcoholic beverage policy being two that you mentioned. And I wondered, with your attitude somewhat advanced and the students apparently dissatisfied with the speed with which these came about, how do these two things mesh?

Well, on a lot of these it has been difficult, and I think way back when on tape number one or two, we talked about the Board of Regents representing the people of the state, and I think they accurately—fairly accurately—do represent the people of the state. Any of these important things have been changes in Board of Regents' policy, and they've had to be approved by the board, and some of them [like ROTC] have been very difficult. It took two or three presentations to the Board of Regents to get the change in the alcoholic beverage policy, for example. In the case of residence hall rules -and regulations, which was handled a slightly different way, the board had many years ago set up a pattern of rules and regulations about hours and a variety of other things. My first presentation to the board on this—in '67 or '68 or whenever— was [for] the board to in effect, kind of remove itself from rule making for this purpose and to leave this with the administration. I did not try to deceive them about, you know, what I had in mind, and they knew that given this choice, we'd have students join with the staff in student services in determining hours—visitation hours and a variety of other things.

That, incidentally, was a kind of interesting—it was done a little differently. The board was greatly concerned about this, and as I recall, it went to the board and then was referred to the student affairs committee of the board. The board was operating more with committees in those days than is true now. We had a very interesting session with this committee of the board and Harold Jacobsen, who was not chairman of the Board of Regents then but was either member or chairman of the student affairs board, I recall quite well, was at the meeting. We had a scheduled meeting with a couple of people in Student Affairs, and I was there, and the presidents of the residence halls. This was a very interesting and mature political kind of thing that the students did. A couple of the most active students were male students, and this was in the beginnings of the time when long hair on male students was just beginning to become the thing on this campus. And a couple of these students had been wearing their hair down to their shoulders [gesture] and they showed up at this committee meeting and I didn't recognize them because they very shrewdly had gone out and got haircuts and they were all dressed up in a conservative fashion, and made a very rational, low-keyed, but carefully thought through presentation of their position on this. And it worked. It really did. One of the things that I admire very much about Harold Jacobsen (and I know he's misunderstood by a lot of students and faculty) is that he does listen, and he does indeed when a good case is presented to him, he's willing to change his mind. And he did on this. And I think this is great. And this is the way a member of the policy-making board should be. But he started off very much on one side and they convinced him. It's, you know, it's a kind of—maybe it's playing the game, but it's a real-life game. It's the kind that people

do when they apply for jobs or when they want to make an impression on a young lady, or whatever. They recognize that a different style is appropriate to that occasion, and that's what they did in this situation and they did it effectively.

At any rate, we got at least some members of the student affairs committee of the Board to support the position we were taking. And it did pass. It was not as painful as the alcoholic beverage or the ROTC thing, but in many ways since then, it's been more painful, because while they've given up or delegated the rule-making rights on this, they sure like to second-guess, get a lot of questions and a lot of comments, a lot of criticism about what goes on in student life generally on the campus. I think this is decreasing, too, though. I think it has been— not just this year—I think it's been decreasing for the last several years. I think greater acceptance of students as they are as human beings has taken place.

One of the other kinds of things that I was greatly concerned about was not just life styles and freedoms and responsibilities and individual learning, but trying to get some effective student input into a whole variety of things about the University. So I started the first year I was here, with a few exceptions, all the committees and boards and ad hoc groups or any group that dealt with matters of the University policy or procedure. I appointed students to them as full voting members. The few exceptions were ones that were exceptions because of the nature of the thing, like a sabbatical leave committee. Perhaps students should be represented on it, but it still seems to me to be very much a faculty thing. But all other committees. And since then, students have been fully represented as voting members. And indeed on some occasions, students have

been chairmen of very important committees student-faculty committees, like the Student Affairs committee. A couple of times we've had student chairmen. This has worked, I think, moderately well, not as well as I hoped it would. But again, I think even when it hasn't worked, it's been part of the learning process for students.

The faculty complaint is that students don't show up at meetings, or when they do they come irregularly, and therefore, never are on top of whatever problem the committee's dealing with. And I think this is a justifiable criticism. I think this has happened. On the other hand, some very strong members of committees on this campus have been students. So it's a mixed bag. I could point to a lot of faculty who never show up, also, at committee meetings, and who don't carry their weight. It's probably a little bit more with students. I think they are not quite as interested on a lifetime basis, not quite that committed as faculty.

I think it's worth—I certainly don't intend to abandon it.

A few minutes ago, you said that along with these satisfactions in helping along these changes, you had some enormous disappointments. I wondered if you'd like to go into that a little bit.

I think if I can make plural into singular, in another interview for another purpose, I think I talked about *a* disappointment with the way in which the Governor's Day [1970] thing turned out.* This was not just students, but faculty also. I do not share the feeling that

*Collection of taped interviews on this topic in the University Archives, as well as two research volumes in the University of Nevada Oral History Program Collection.

that was a horrendous event, but I think in the tape I made, if I didn't say it, it was because it was too soon afterwards, but my being upset at that was primarily on the basis of fear that we were going to lose a lot of the rights and privileges that we had gained. I think the thing that, at the time and since then, that's bothered me was the way in which this was done, made it almost inevitable. We got a lot of attacks on freedoms of students and, "nobody's in charge," and you know, this sort of thing. And they did come, attacks of this sort.

I'm not sure and I know what I would like to have had happen on that day, you know, I can't reconstruct it maybe even any other way, because I fully sympathize with the desire to protest on that day. That's fine. It should have happened; if I'd been a student I would have wanted to express myself, too. And I also understand the temptation brought about by the ROTC review that day. So I'm not sure what should have happened, but it was an enormously disappointing kind of way for the thing to turn out.

I think what I would have liked to have happen would have been for them to have done what they did, up through the point of their coming up to the stadium and making their march around the stadium, and then from that point allowed the ceremony to go on. I think maybe it's still not the right way, but that would have satisfied me, that their point would have been made, but without impinging on the rights of other people who also had their rights that day. And some of the cruel things that happened to individual people, I think, were most unfortunate, like the Wishams.

I think that probably is the one enormous disappointment I had, maybe was subconsciously what I had in mind when I said enormous, because there are inevitable disappointments, as there are when you raise

children, or when you are married to a wife, or have brothers or sister, or whatever, that you have close relationships to. But not many enormous ones. The consequences have not been as bad as I thought they would be at the time. They were very painful, but I think no—I'd like sometime to re-hear or re-see that earlier tape. I suspect my predictions for dire things to come were worse than actually came. You know, we really didn't end up losing any of these privileges and rights, but I think we came awfully close to it. The scars are still there. I cannot go out any place in the state without still hearing about, you know, Governor's Day, or Paul Adamian, or whatever phrase is the symbolic one that people want to use these days. That situation, not just here, but across the country, I think those of us in an older generation just so totally failed to understand the feelings of young people that week. And I think that's the tragedy of it, you know, really, not just here, but across the country. I think the responses of students often were inappropriate, as I thought our student response was inappropriate. But respond they had to do. At the time, I thought they—you know—if I were in their shoes, I would, too. I don't think adults twenty years removed from their ages ever really, even now, understand the kind of really strong emotional feelings that Kent State and the escalation of the war and all of these things falling together at the same time really meant. These young people are so worldly-conscious; not just conscious, but so many of them are so concerned about the world in which they live, that I don't think many older people give them that kind of credit. I think they view it as a very dangerous kind of prank thing, you know, and it's not that at all. Or it's something that if they were just good children they wouldn't behave that way. Well, maybe some of the behaviors were inappropriate, but the

kind of emotions stirred by that series of events, and striking a compassionate group of people, it's inevitable that some kind of response take place. That's part of our problem in this state. I think they think it's they—people of the state think it either is a matter of, “nobody's in charge,” which is the thing I hear most frequently, of course, from critics, from my critics; that, you know, I'm not running the show. Or that this kind of society that we permitted to develop on this campus has so much freedom and they've been stirred up so much by radical speakers that they do things that no sane people would do. The connection between what are viewed as radical speakers and actions of that sort, I still hear about.

I don't believe in the unbridgeable, wide communication and generation gap that used to be written about so furiously, three or four years ago. But in this instance, I think there was a—to generalize—a gap between the generations—not everybody—and not all students were concerned this way, either, of course.

Well, you asked about [N. Edd Miller Day]. That was—if I mentioned enormous disappointment—that was an enormous surprise, and a totally unforgettable kind of thing, and very touching, and it was truly a surprise. Nena knew about this a day or two in advance, and my son was here that year, and in school and apparently he knew about it the night before. Somebody decided they'd better clue him in. I usually get here early in the morning and I should have been very suspicious. Among other things, Nena stays up late and gets up later in the morning by a couple of hours than I do. But she'd cooked up some excuse about coming to a breakfast meeting on campus that morning, and I guess Rosella Linskie or somebody that she knows on the faculty had confirmed this to me that, “Now, Nena's going to be there for

breakfast with my class,” or whatever it was, and so my suspicion was allayed altogether. I got up that morning and Nena was late, as she sometimes is [smiling] when we're going off together. Went out to get in the car and it was dark outside and I got to the car door and there were balloons tied to the car door, and I thought, “Oh.” And I looked out and there were balloons tied to our mailbox and shrubs around the house and I really thought some fraternity had been having some kind of fun and games the night before. Then as we drove to the campus, without fail, every telephone pole and every place they could tie balloons—I've never seen so many thousands of balloons—all the way to campus. And then as we turned on Ninth Street, stopped at the stop sign right outside the gates of the campus, there was an enormous crowd of people—couple of thousand I guess—with torches. And somebody opened the door and grabbed me, and I really [laughs] thought, “Well, this is it.” [Laughing] What had been happening on other campuses had finally occurred here. But it turned out to be an extremely nice occasion, and in every way.

They had planned it so carefully and so quietly that I probably should have been suspicious, but I wasn't, and I'm glad I wasn't, you know. It was the kind of thing that [was] a nice surprise and to have spoiled their fun and mine too, why, finding out ahead of time would have been too bad.

Warren Blankenship, who was administrative intern here in the American Council of Education, has an internship program, and he was on campus that year. He wrote a little article and I have a couple of reprints—I'll give you one of them—about this for the *Educational Record*.^{*} It tells more than I could tell you.

^{*}Copy in University Archives.

It was a very humbling kind of experience, too. I must say that I uh—well, you know, [laughs] it's the kind of thing I really didn't feel that they should be doing. I really shouldn't be doing this. But the fact that they wanted to do it and did it, was a kind of very nice and very humbling kind of experience, too. You know, I'm not out to win a popularity contest or I wouldn't be in this kind of job. The fact that I had won a popularity contest was kinda nice, but that's not what I've been trying to do. So it was very nice. I don't know— [laughs].

It was unique [laughing], and it did catch an awful lot of national attention. I guess I got about four or five hundred letters from people, kids I went to high school with, I hadn't heard from since high school had read it in the paper someplace, and people I'd never heard [of] who wrote. I spent the next three months answering these letters. I did respond to all of them that had taken the time to write me. I wouldn't be truthful if I didn't say I enjoyed it, because I did.

One of the nice things about it was that they so fully included my wife in this too, and she deserved that. And, you know, it was for her too; it wasn't just me. They gave her a nice charm bracelet with the date on it and all this sort of thing, which meant a great—still does—means a great deal to her. So, you know, it's just nice for both of us.

There's really not much to say about it [laughing].

Ed Olsen called the *Chronicle of Higher Education* about this that day, and said, "I thought you'd like to know that they had a demonstration on the campus for our president—student demonstration."

And so the reporter said, "So. What's new?" having misunderstood and the for, thinking demonstration against. They carried a nice story, too.

When we got to San Francisco, the television stations, two of them, sent the crews out to the hotel to interview me and— [laughs] I guess it must have been quite an event, in terms of news media.

But that's a lot of water under the bridge since then. Although a year ago, in November, 1971, I had the same kind of feeling, only with a great deal more humility about that situation. But the students again, I think, came and expressed themselves very strongly and very well. That's enough of that.

This is kind of free association from that, but, I think by and large, some of the individual students—some who've come into leadership positions on the campus and I, have a curious kind of relationship. Some of the leaders, for example, in creating that N. Edd Miller Day, were some of the same people that later in that year were pounding the table at me and hurling sometimes obscene epithets. And yet, even that was kind of at-that-moment-in-time thing.

I recall that at one of the two big confrontation sessions we had that spring of that school year, one of the black students who was shouting at me from way back all during that session, toward the end of the evening as the crowd broke up, stuck something in my pocket, and when I got back to the office, [I] looked at—it was a note he'd written me, saying something to the effect that, "Despite the fact that we're on opposite sides on this, I'm still your friend, and maybe we can get together and work out something privately." He obviously had a problem of his leadership, that he didn't dare capitulate or give any signs of this.

And the same thing was true with several of the others. We had dinner together a couple of times. I did with Dan Kinney, for example, who was the most vocal at that period of time among the black students. And a lot of these kids would kinda sneak into the office from

time to time [laughing] to reassure me that they're really fighting on a matter of principle. I think this is the reason I wanted to get this on tape is, not because of any personal thing, but because I think this is a very important thing to be brought out about the students, and part of the kind of the maturity thing that I was talking about.

It may sound childish, but I think it's kind of mature that they're able to deal with issues without wrapping the individual so totally in it that he becomes the part of the issue. At the same time, I think they're subconsciously aware of the symbolism of dealing with the president of the university, that they've got to do this, that a confrontation—at least in those days—was no good unless the person you confronted was the president of the university, and that the rhetoric had to be strong and all this sort of thing.

So, you know, in a way on the surface it sounds kind of childish, but it's at least as mature as members of the Senate of the United States who can be bitterly involved in debate with each other and have a drink together later, or two attorneys in a court room. I think it's much this kind of the thing that society accepts and I think much of that was in existence then, and is now.

There are very few of these people that have been in the kind of leadership role that involved confrontations that even at the time, I didn't, you know—we kept in close personal touch. And certainly since then, I correspond with them and they come to see me. Dan Teglia was in the office yesterday, for example, and he was very active during that period.

You know, I understand what they had to do, and more, power to them. But I also am pleased that we've maintained friendships despite all this, which I think is a good sign.

I don't mean to say that they all like me, or anything of the sort [laughing]. I don't want to

be misunderstood on this, but I think it gets to a point I was talking about earlier. A lot of them do not like me, and some of them I'd just as soon not see again, too, but I think in the case of most of them, that we continue to maintain two levels of relationships that were important—both levels important—to us.

I have talked to some other college presidents who've had similar kinds of experiences, perhaps, to repeat, not as widespread or with as many people as I've had here, but frequently they're people I get along with fine in other contexts, but for this purpose, on this occasion, they've got to be antagonists, and they operate that way.

Well, maybe a word or two about fraternities and sororities. I think fraternities and sororities have survived better here than at most other institutions, certainly most that I know of. The sororities are still relatively strong and healthy. I think this current year they had some problems in pledging and recruiting. But by and large, I think they've maintained themselves reasonably well. In fact, just about two years ago, we chartered a chapter of a new sorority on this campus, and that's almost unheard of these days, except in new institutions. Older institutions like this one, fraternity and sorority chapters tend to be dropping by the wayside rather than new ones being added. And it's, I think, a reflection of the long tradition and the great and very strong role that fraternities and sororities played in the life of this University until very recent years. So maybe they're just riding on the momentum of the past. With respect to the fraternities, I think that is what's happening. Sororities are much more interested and much more concerned about changing their—modifying, at least, their goals to emphasize such things as the viability of living in small groups, playing down the ritualistic and even in some of the social kinds of things.

Fraternities—to generalize—on this campus, have not been able to make this kind of adjustment, and I think that's one reason why they are in more serious trouble. The ATO's and the SAE's and the Sigma Nus, which are the three traditionally strong fraternities on this campus, are all this year, and who knows, next year it'll be different, but they're all in serious trouble this year. They're not getting pledges.

Other students on campus, and faculty and administrators are less and less tolerant of the wild drinking bouts and pillaging and raiding of sorority houses and this sort of thing that were great fun in the '30's and until World War II. They're consequently losing a lot of the kind of tacit support that they've had from students, even independents who kind of expected that as a way of life. And they're finding it difficult to get pledges. Unless there are some rather drastic modifications in the way they view themselves in the next few years, I think they'll be gone. I just don't think they'll survive.

If that's the way they are, I would be the first to say good riddance. I do think there are ways in which they can restructure themselves Without losing some of their tradition, and be a good and important part of the campus, particularly as a small social group where a student can get a lot of close reinforcement. The kinds of things that I think earlier we talked about trying to do for minority students, if you will. That, you know, [is] a great opportunity in a fraternity house or sorority house to do this kind of thing. But the way they have been, if they continue that way, they're anachronisms.

How about some of the other social type groups. One that comes to mind is the Sundowners. They've been periodically accepted and not accepted, not acceptable.

Well, their current status is that they're not accepted or acceptable. Their official recognition as a University group was withdrawn, finally. They had been on probation and they violated that, so we've yanked their official recognition. Officially they're a non-organization. But obviously, they continue to exist. They are in my opinion—if I called fraternities on the edge of being anachronisms, they have been anachronisms for many years—they're repulsive ones [laughs] in my opinion. And I think, as far as I'm concerned they run counter to the kinds of things that I think ought to be happening on a university campus, that there ought not to be room for that kind of crude, vulgar for vulgarity's sake kind of thing, that crudeness for crudeness's sake, or drunkenness for drunkenness's sake.

Our official stance as far as office of student affairs and this office is concerned, is to crack down on them. For example, at this year's Homecoming, Roberta Barnes talked to the Reno police, that if they are—you know, if they come in and interfere with the Wolve's Frolic and bring their chickens and stumble around in the auditorium, that as far as she's concerned, they're to be arrested. They got the word, and as far as I know, not a one showed up in the building. I saw as I was standing in line, a rather long line to buy tickets to get in, there were a few of them out on the plaza in front of the auditorium. They saw me and made a big circle around [laughs] back to the end of the line, talking to students. But I think they're aware of the fact that they're persona non grata right now on campus. That's about all the vitriolic things I can think to say about them. They just are, in my opinion, totally out of place. You know, I can understand young people that age drinking too much, going to parties that become loud and boisterous, but I can't understand this as a way of life, and

that's my impression, at least, of the goal of the organization. And again, some of these are very nice people when they're sober and on campus, but the chemistry of the group ruins them. That's about all I have to say about the Sundowners [laughs].

I'm not sure how to put a handle on this, but maybe one way would be to talk about the stereotype about student attitudes on this campus, the notion that this is a "party school" [a] university in the last fifteen or twenty years has been written up as such in *Playboy* and similar "scholarly" journals. I suppose it's inevitable that any school that has a history that would lead to this, as I think this University did, when the school was very small and when fraternities and sororities were very big, and half or more of the population of the school belonged to fraternities and sororities, and fraternities and sororities had a social life as *the* important thing, it would be perhaps semi-fair, at least, to characterize the University as being a party school. And I think another reason for this stereotype is not just the historical matters in fact, but the location of the school, I think, contributes to that.

We're in a city that has a worldwide reputation as being a divorce capital, and divorce, at least in an earlier generation, had a kind of stigma to it. Maybe *stigma's* not the right word, but it was something associated with the Reno divorce picture, at least, with wealthy people who could afford what now would be participation in the jet set, I don't know what it was called then, but it would be that kind of thing. Reno is also a city where gambling is a very important aspect of its life, it's near well-known ski centers, you know, the whole atmosphere of the stereotype about Reno is such that it would brush off into a stereotype about a university located in that city. While there is still, I think, a good deal

of play at this university, I think there is at any university, and perhaps a little more here than elsewhere.

It seems to me that the last several years have seen a real shift in student attitudes in what they're doing here. I think I mentioned earlier in talking about Sundowners—to characterize the student attitude, I think they're not very tolerant any more of a group like that, whereas they used to be. And I think that's a sign broadly of students here being much more interested in the kind of intellectual and learning atmosphere than in the party atmosphere.

I've had an opportunity twice in the last two years to see first-hand the kind of demands that students make with respect to teaching on the campus, because I've taught twice in the last two years, unfortunately no more than that, but at least on these two occasions. I was very impressed with the kind of rigor that students impose upon themselves pretty generally (not every one of them), in the two classes that I met. As a matter of fact, the class in conference and discussion methods that I taught a year ago last spring, one of the criticisms that the students gave of my method of managing the class was that they would have preferred to see a good deal more of their own conclusion-drawing about the principles involved, less of the lecture kind of thing and more of themselves bringing out the kinds of conclusions from things we talked about. And I find this heartening, that this is what they wanted rather than being handed things. You know, "Here are all the answers and you write them down carefully." I was impressed, I think, both times, with the general atmosphere and the general demand that students made.

And I think we see this on campus. Rick Elmore, at the meeting we just had a couple of weeks ago with the governor, expressed as

the major concern with respect to budget for the University, more operating money for the University library in order that it might stay open longer to meet the needs of students. And I believe he was fairly representing a serious concern of students. Not that seven thousand students would flood the library these extra hours, but I think there's enough demand for more library time to have made this a reasonable statement of student opinion about where money should go at the University. I think our students—and I think it's probably true nationally, it's certainly true here—are more like the immediate post-World War II veterans in terms of what they expect from a university than they are like the students of the late 1950's and early 1960's. Certainly much more like that than pre-World War II students.

I think there's an important difference though. I don't want to mislead by comparison with the World War II veterans group. That group of students was so heavily and deeply motivated toward jobs. I think that's less true of our students these days. I think they're perhaps more interested in the process of learning and in a whole different set of social problems, more societal-based kinds of things and less individual-based kinds of things. But the comparison stands up in terms of a strong interest in learning, a strong motivation to make these four or five years truly count as something more than a lapse between adolescence and adulthood.

One of the kinds of ways that I think students—well, there's several ways they show this, a renewed interest on the part of students in the effectiveness of teaching. The teacher evaluation program on this campus, I think is a sign of that. The students have not done this well, but their intentions are very good. The mechanics of doing it, I think leave a lot

to be desired. And in talking with this year's chairman of this thing, I have suggested that maybe they'd better spend this year working on mechanics, even if it's a lost year in terms of outcome, so that the outcomes in the future can be better. It's not been done well, but the fact that they intensely want to do it is, I think, a very good sign. They are concerned about that aspect of the learning environment that's represented in the teaching that goes on.

I think another kind of manifestation of this, although it's not active this year, is the development of the "free university" and the "experimental university" on this campus. They never have been as strong as they have been on some of the larger campuses, but their very existence is an indication of a kind of intellectual groping that students are doing, an intellectual dissatisfaction with the categorized kind of learning that the university kind of imposes on them. So it's part, I think, of this great interest, a growing interest in a good learning environment.

You still hear all these attacks on the preparation that the students receive in the lower level. They don't read, they don't write, they don't spell, all these kinds of accusations against the public school systems, and yet this intense intellectual interest at the upper level, seems to need some kind of explanation.

I'm not sure. I think some of the criticisms are true, but they're mechanistic criticisms, really, that the students don't know how to spell or can't add—and I'm not playing these down; I think it's important that an educated person be able, at least a kind of—whatever a minimum level is—that he be able to spell and add and read and write. But these are mechanistic. Maybe one thing that happens when the student comes to the university is that these are not viewed as

ends unto themselves, as they often are in the public schools, but rather as means to more important ends of thinking problems through, of working on decisions, or drawing conclusions, or analysis, or synthesis of ideas. And maybe this kind of bursting out from the “learning the tools” part to having an opportunity to be creative with these tools is maybe what happens, maybe that’s the transformation.

I also think that another aspect of this is that we really are not giving as much consideration to the informal education our students are getting as we should. I think we still tend to think as parents and as adults much older than these young adults, we probably still compartmentalize education as being that little bit of life that takes place in the schools. As much trash and trivia as there is on television, I don’t think—we can discount that as a very important educating factor, and I don’t think we think about that as much as we should, or, you know, that we take account of that as much as we should. The revolution in communication, not just in television, but in such a thing as book publishing, I can recall—I still have at home someplace—the first numbered, one, two, three, four, five, copies of the Pocket Library, the first major paperback publication. As I recall, *Lost Horizon* was in that group, those first five. I’m sorry I can’t remember them now, but that must have been about 1939—’38—’39—someplace in there. You know, until that time, if you wanted a copy of *Lost Horizon*, you either got it out of the library, which involved considerable effort, and also had the inhibiting things for reading for pleasure about library books. [You] can’t go back and reread, or take your time about reading, or whatever. Or you had to spend relatively a large amount of money to buy a hardcover copy. The advent of these—at

that time—twenty-five cent books, was, you know, really revolutionary. Now of course, if anything, it’s more difficult to find stores that sell the hardcover books. Our own bookstore, you can buy anything you want in paperbacks, but it’s difficult to find a hardcover book.

Well, this is again, a revolution I don’t think we take full account of. As I see young people traveling on planes and even hitchhiking, they’re very apt to have in their hand or their pocket a book, you know. And that Wasn’t true when I was growing up. Not very many of them had books, ’cause they were too hard to come by, for casual reading.

Well, I didn’t mean to get off on that, but it’s more than television. I think that the sources of informal education and informal information are so much wider now than they ever have been before, that I think we tend to lose account of that. And so our students come here and have the freedom to make use of some of these informal sources that they’ve grown up with, I think they do it better than they do, again, in the public schools, in elementary school or in high school. I don’t know, [laughs] your guess is as good as mine.

It’s one [problem] I think about a lot, but I’m not sure. I think it’s really those two or three things that we do tend, even though we fuss a lot about our students are not well prepared in skills and the language and so on, we really, you know, it’s a kind of grade three fussing that we do. We don’t view it as *the* thing. We’d rather have them, you know, deal with ideas. And part of the criticism we receive of English 101 is that the students there are forced to deal with ideas, and less with grammatical kinds of things, vocabulary kinds of things. I just think they’re a lot better prepared through these informal ways than you and I were.

I think part of the change in attitudes toward intercollegiate athletics on the part of students is part of this change in attitude generally. The student demand, for example, of several years ago, for dropping the marching band, I think, was the first significant sign of this, and while that's not truly intercollegiate athletics, it's tied up so much with it, I think, it was part of the picture. They simply did not want to support this kind of activity, and the students in the music department didn't view it as an important activity. Virtually no one except alumni—once a year—viewed it as important. It was even, I think, as a kind of expensive fluff, and that's about all.

Then we began having the same kinds of concerns about support of an athletic program that a good many other schools have had. We're not alone in this at all. The traditional thing has been for as long, I suppose, as there have been intercollegiate athletics, for athletics to be supported largely through student fees, and, in all colleges and universities. One way in which student unrest about universities manifested itself in the '65 to '69 to '70 period, was the effort in many schools (and some successful), to remove this kind of fee support for intercollegiate athletics. We've never had that serious a move on this campus, although there've been some efforts fairly close to it. The proposal that Jon Wellinshof, Frankie Sue Del Papa's administrative assistant, made, that all student fees for athletics go into the support of basketball; it never got anyplace, [but] I think, was a sign of this kind of dissatisfaction with support for a sports program, broadly.

I really don't have any way of telling how important athletics is to the student body here. I wish I did. I desperately wish I did. Students attend football and basketball games in moderate numbers, but even at the big athletic schools, they only attend in moderate numbers. That's all they ever have done, so I'm

not sure that's a good indicator of whether they want a sports program or not. The only thing that's different is that I think until very recently, there never was much student criticism of athletics. So maybe this negative barometer is a better one than a positive one. There is a good deal of it now, and a good deal of understandable demand that if students support this, students should have a greater control, or greater say about what happens. And here, one of the places where the student leadership and I have had a real difference is on this problem.

A couple of years ago, the student demand was very strong for increased control over athletics, and they were showing this by what in my opinion—I present now my prejudices on this, not theirs [laughs], I hasten to say—a period of two or three years of, in my opinion, a kind of harassment of those administratively in charge of the programs, athletic directors, coaches and so on, refusing to approve from the student fees, refusing to approve budgets presented, or taking extraordinarily long times to do this, questioning very minor items on the budgets and so on. In my opinion, at least, it was a kind of harassment that was giving a great deal of instability to the program, was affecting the morale of the athletes on campus, as well as the coaches, and was consuming an enormous amount of energy on the part of student government. There was a period of a year or so when this way, you know, about all the finance control board was doing, was picking to pieces the various budgets of intercollegiate athletics.

So I recommended to the regents that the seven-dollar and fifty-cent fee be automatically put in a different account, an intercollegiate athletics account, seven dollars for men's programs and fifty cents for women's programs, rather than being part of general ASUN fee and then reallocated to athletics.

ASUN had to do this anyway, because regents' policy of many years standing was that seven dollars and fifty cents of the ASUN fee went to athletics, so their only recourse was' a harassment kind of thing. So my recommendation was that it all be separated and that the intercollegiate board make recommendations to me about budget and how the money should be spent, by means of a subcommittee made up equally of students and faculty. And that's where it stands now.

The students, I think, [and] Frankie Sue did not like this as one president, Dan Klaich didn't like it, nor does Rick Elmore. These are the three ASUN presidents that have been involved since this took place. But in my opinion, it's a matter of conservation of energy to accomplish what already was forced on the students. I keep saying this is just my opinion, my rationalizations. I guess the point of getting into this at all is to say that there clearly has been some different attitudes toward athletics than in past years, more critical, less interested perhaps. And if it is to go on with demand for greater voice in what happens

Part of the problem here has been that we've not had successful teams, and I think this sometimes reduces the problem at least. I think if our current basketball fortunes continue as they've started, that we'll hear less criticism of intercollegiate athletics than in the past, from students as well as others. That's normal; maybe I should just keep praying for good seasons in football, and [laughs] basketball in particular.

I think we have (and I think I've said this before) about the right kind of athletic program. I do not want it to get much bigger, some bigger I think; it needs some strengthening, but I think where it needs strengthening most is in providing more opportunities for women's athletics,

participation by women. But I don't want to be a major athletic power, and I don't want this school to be that. And I think in that sense, the students and I do agree. I think basically our coaches agreed on that, too.

I think there's no questioning that major part of the faculty concern about athletics really is more than anything else, that a feeling on the part of some faculty that inappropriate recruiting has taken place, and that inappropriate or nonexistent concern for the students after they're here with respect to their academic careers. I think that probably is the single most crucial factor as far as faculty is concerned, and I think it also is important to students. And I think there may be some truth in this. The reason, I think, is that because many of the minority students, particularly blacks, who are recruited, either express this or accept leadership among the black students who say this kind of thing. And the fact that they accept this leadership, I think, is a sign that they feel that something's wrong with the way in which they get here.

For a great many years, virtually the only black students on this campus—maybe all of them—were those recruited as athletes. And it's only been in recent years that we've been recruiting other kinds of students from minority groups. But still, a large minority of the black students who are here are here recruited to play basketball or football or other sports.

First let me say, I think the criticism about the recruiting practices is a legitimate criticism. I think too often our coaches, until recent years, when they've become quite aware of the problem because they've been talked to a good deal, and I think they're smart enough to see what's happening too on campus. But until recent, very recent years, a football coach was apt to just look for somebody who could play guard on a defensive team well, who

was big and could tackle, and who'd proved himself in a community college doing this, and then, you know, recruit him, not as a student, but as a guard on a defensive team. Because the whole social patterns of life, and especially of life of young adults, is changed, and life in universities, I don't think either those students or the vast majority of the students around them, white or black, are now willing to accept this kind of second-class citizenship, or this dehumanizing kind of citizenship. It becomes then a focal point for a demand for equal treatment in all things, not just being a football player on ten Saturdays a year.

I'm not saying this very well, but what I'm trying to say is that I think the recruiting practices have brought to us some students who were really not expected to be much more than a football player or a basketball player. They were smart enough to see that they were not really viewed by their coaches as being full-scale students, and other students saw this and began resenting it, and I think that's a more important factor that has led to some of the unrest on the part of blacks on this campus than anything else.

Now I should say that in this process, also, in my opinion, there have been two or three who are rather glib rhetoricians, and who've seen an opportunity to practice some demagoguery with their own people, by seeing this as a quick and easy route to leadership positions, and I think have taken advantage of this situation. But these are only two or three, and I repeat that they would not be successful if there were not the kind of unhappiness on the part of all of them growing out of this other thing that I mentioned. I guess what I'm saying is that the "troublemakers" have been brought in too; but in large numbers, you know, that's not the big problem here. It's not a whole host of

blacks brought in from California or Texas who are nothing but troublemakers. I think it's a social kind of Situation that has led to their unhappiness and unrest.

This showed itself, of course, most pointedly in the issue of last October [1971] with respect to the request for an office for the Black Student Union. And not all of the people involved in this were athletes, but some of the leadership were either on the track team or the football team or the basketball team. What I've been saying I think, I hope, kind of describes a set of circumstances that is a basic causal factor, and it seems to me that was a more important basic causal factor than a demand for an office.

The office thing became purely a symbol—purely that and nothing more, in my opinion. The office was initially a way in which they could say to themselves and to the rest of the students that they were more than right guards or left guards or forwards on a basketball team or sprinters on a track team, that they were indeed full-scale students here with the same kind of privileges that other students had.

With that background, the mechanics of the thing that happened was that they had seen me about office space—a few of the leaders had. The available office space on this [campus] for faculty—the office space over which I have control—is virtually nil. And I told them this, that I could not see any way to provide space for them. I don't know where we would get this space. So they turned then to Dan Klaich about space in the Union. The Union space is, with the exception of the dining commons and the snack bar and the health service, all the rest of the space is student-controlled. They do the scheduling and everything else; they pay rent to have that space under their control. Dan Klaich said that there was no space, but that he would, as

I recall, that he would make space available in the basement of the Student Services building where the *Sagebrush* was housed.

By now the frustration on the part of the black student leadership was quite great. They felt they were getting a runaround from Dan Klaich, and then to be told that the only space available was in the basement of a building without proper ventilation and lighting and exits and entrances and so on, the symbolism took on greater meaning, that they could have space but it was below ground. It was a kind of “slave quarter” space, in a way. And that’s why I keep stressing the symbolism—even though in actual fact this was space that for many years has been used by student groups, and it was space over which the students had control. By then, though, they were not in a position to accept this. They had worked themselves, and we had worked them, into a place where they could not accept this kind of space. It had to be good space, not just space. So they moved in on the office of one of the officers of ASUN—on the vice president’s office—and announced they would stay there until it was officially given to them.

Dan Klaich called me that day about one o’clock to explain what had happened, and, what should be done? It seemed to me that, I told him the alternatives were, to either provide adequate space for them, to talk them out of a forceful takeover, or give that space to them. That seemed to me to be the alternatives. But it was his decision. I could advise him, but I was not shifting the buck to him, except insofar as I believe if we take student government seriously, that if they have a problem, they should be given the first opportunity to solve the problem. And only as a last resort should it be solved elsewhere. And he understood all this. I also told him that I had an obligation. If the intention was to occupy a building more than the normal

hours in which a building was occupied, that I could not permit that [in] any building on campus, and that by the time the Union closed that day, if they were not out of there, that then I would have to move in.

So, by five o’clock, he and Stan Davis, the president of BSU, had worked out a moratorium for a week, in which they could discuss what possibilities there were for space. I was over at the Union about four, and met with the two of them, mostly just to be there to listen. They worked it out; I did not. But it seemed to me it was a mature kind of thing to do, that the BSU had made its point and an honest offer to help solve a problem was being made and accepted. So during the week, there was much hurrying and scurrying about trying to find space. But the space problem is acute; there is no question about it. And short of one of the elected officers of ASUN giving up his own office, the only alternative was the basement space in the Student Services building. And that did not satisfy, so one week later, the occupation of the whole suite of ASUN took place.

At Dan’s request—he felt the situation was gone then, that he had done everything that he could and that he couldn’t come up with any other kind of alternatives. So at his request—and it was at his request—I did not move in that week—he put it in my hands—by the time, five o’clock, which we gave [as] a deadline to the BSU, that they had to be out of there by five, which is the normal closing time not of the building, but of that set of offices, it seemed clear to me that this was not going to happen. So I contacted our University police, and asked that they have standby police near the campus, but not on the campus until I gave the word, or unless I gave the word, in the event we needed help.

So I went over at five and read to the students through the door—the door was

locked—a statement about giving them another fifteen minutes to come out or I would have to come in with police. Additionally, because I couldn't get in and called in that office and talked to—I'm confident it was Stan Davis, although I cannot obviously be absolutely certain, told him the same thing over the telephone. I went back to the office and shouted through the door again, and in fact gave them about twenty or thirty minutes, rather than fifteen.

By then the crowd outside the Union was very large and very angry, and probably three or four hundred students jammed at the doors of the Union, about seventy-five in that little corridor by the stairs outside the ASUN office. And I decided that regardless of how it appeared, that I wanted a lot of police, not for fourteen students, but for four hundred students and possibilities of somebody striking out and hitting somebody else in that crowd and then a horrible kind of thing breaking out. So I asked Chief Malone, our University police chief, to bring around to the side of the campus in a not real obvious way, but, let's get enough police to control a crowd if this really developed this way.

The first problem was clearing the corridor, and that took an extra fifteen minutes. People simply were not moving. And fortunately, there were some faculty people and some students there who helped a great deal in clearing them, together with the police. And then when this was cleared, and we had an avenue out of the building, the acting chief of police, for the city police, the sheriff, the chief—our chief, Malone—the three top people, forced the door and brought them out with—as I recall, it was necessary to get in to use some tear gas, and fourteen came out. There were about thirty in there originally, but somehow or other during the extra fifteen or twenty minutes of the time,

they had discovered a trap door onto the roof of the building and so only fourteen were left. If I'm right about my assumption of talking to Stan Davis, who was the president of BSU, he's one who got away, if he were indeed in that room. But fourteen students were taken from the office and taken downtown and booked, because this by state law was in violation of a statute of the state.

It was an extremely painful thing for me to do—extremely painful. It still is, just thinking about it. I did not want to have other than University police involved. That's one thing. Another thing is that I do not like to see students in trouble, particularly when I understand that there are some legitimate reasons for their [trouble], and even if they'd made their own trouble, that they did it with some good reason. And I think that was true in this case. But at the same time, I felt I had no alternative under the law than to do this. And with respect to the police, that mob of four hundred people—you know this campus as well as I do—many of them on one side with their cowboy boots showing and their big hats on, and they were wearing their uniforms, too. And the liberal group close to the door and being pushed out of the building. My opinion, at least, of the situation was a very dangerous situation, and in my opinion—I'm not trying to be overdramatic—I think it could have led to somebody being very seriously hurt or killed. And I didn't want that to happen. So I'd rather have had the pictures that appeared later of—you know—fifteen police cars to take fourteen poor students downtown than to have had a picture later of ambulances leaving the campus. And so that's the way it was done.

I think the outcome was—both downtown and on campus—since they were in violation both of state law and of university regulations, was minimal, the penalties were minimal, which was good. I think that they had made

their point and we had made an important point also, which I think we should have, that there is a limit beyond which, for whatever reason, we cannot go. And I think both points were made and nobody was hurt, physically at least.

The leadership has always been a problem for that group, as long as that group has existed here. And it's fairly recent, you know. There was no Black Student Union, or anything comparable to it when I came here. The first group was about 1968. The group began having—almost from the beginning—some real spasms about its leadership.

They often would elect kind of moderates. Their first leader was a young man named Lloyd Walker, who is now a member of our faculty, as a matter of fact. He was a kind of a moderate. Their great concern then, because most of them were athletes, was getting a black coach, and I met with them several times, with large groups of them—large by their standards—fourteen or fifteen people, to talk about this kind of problem.

And then they began being taken over by some of the demagogues that I mentioned earlier. Chief among these was Dan Kinney, and I really have to put him in the category of a demagogue, who was taking advantage of, not just students generally, but of the black students, to boost himself. In my opinion, that is strictly what he was doing. And he was manipulating that group. A very intelligent young man, Emerson Davis, called Stan Davis, a member of our track team, was president [then]. I've talked to him some, not a whole lot since that incident; I correspond with him. [Stan] said in a recent letter essentially the same kind of thing, that he was much more moderate and much less concerned about doing physical things to make points than Dan Kinney. Dan wanted heads bashed, you know, he wanted physical things to happen,

because in his opinion this was the right way to get attention, I guess, to get things done.

[Dan] is a very persuasive person. He used the language beautifully, and one of his sub-leaders, Tex Barrett, is the same way; they both are remarkable and very bright people who can vary the way in which they talk, depending on their audiences, in just remarkable ways. I wish I had the ability. They can use the language of the ghetto in talking to their brothers in a way that makes them appear to be a part of the direst kind of ghetto; neither of them came from that kind of background. But they also can talk in beautiful, accepted standard English to administrators, or presidents of ASUN, or their white counterparts.

Stan's problem was essentially trying to maintain his leadership position and being forced by their rhetoric into taking some kind of physical stand. And that's part of what happened here, I think, that Stan was quite willing, a week before when he met with Dan Klaich, to use this moratorium period of a week (and I think he really meant that, to try to solve the problem), but during that week, Dan Kinney and Tex Barrett would not let up on, "the only solution to this problem is to take over that office, and throw out the white honkies. Belongs to us. We deserve it. It's ours."

So by the end of the week, the emotionalism within the group had build up to such a point that I don't think [Stan] had any choice. So the real leader, really, was Dan Kinney. I'm very pleased that Stan did what he did, because it could have been an infinitely worse situation if he had not been there to buy time, and to make it *only* the take over of an office and not other kinds of things, too.

Tex Barrett, incidentally, was recruited as a basketball player from Houston. A very

bright guy, who's still in town. I don't mean to put him quite in same category as Dan Kinney, although during that period, I think he was one of the two or three among the blacks preaching violence. But I think Dan Kinney was the one who, more than anyone else, was taking advantage of this group. He is smart, and he knew then that there was no way out but disaster, to pursue that course, and that it was not a last resort yet, but it was a dramatic thing to do, and he had been using—as had a few others—Jesse Sattwhite, who attained earlier fame in a trial on campus, and his name was well known. Jesse is not as smart as they were. Jesse was not a student at the time that they got him involved in this. Jesse had become a kind of symbol of a freedom movement by the blacks, and so it was important I think, to Dan that Jesse be there. It gave credence to his motion about what the blacks should do. Jesse was one of those arrested. He was one of the fourteen who couldn't get out the trap door. I'm convinced that he was used in this, quite willingly, but he was used.

Do you want to talk about some of the other activities that the Black Student Union has been involved in? Their Black Week, and their Homecoming Queen, and some of these other things?

As a matter of fact, in a way, it's kind of unfair to dwell on this one thing, because what I've said about it is so negative. It was negative, and it also had so much potential for real violence, and that's the thing, black or white, that really concerned me.

But generally speaking, the Black Student Union, I think, has made some very important advances here, and has influenced the University, I think in many ways. The Black Week, in most years since they've got started

has been good; they've brought to campus, with one exception, I think, good people. They've worked very constructively with high schools and the junior high schools in this city, very constructively, and the kind of proneness toward the office sit-in kind of thing doesn't appear, as far as I know, in their dealings with the younger people of this community. They were successful, I think, in getting, a year ago, a black girl elected as Homecoming Queen, a beautiful girl in every way. That's one of the things I think has been important to the University, that they did this. And it's like a black being elected to take office in a basically white community. It couldn't have happened just by themselves. I think they've won enough respect of white students on campus, so that this kind of thing could happen.

At least individuals in the group, including some leaders, have been very important members of our planning on such things as—in the early days especially—on ethnic studies, on affirmative action programs, on a whole variety of things of this sort, are of great concern to them. So I'm glad you asked, because this one incident ought to be put in the context of about three or four years of very strong and very constructive kinds of things. And they haven't been constructive in the sense of, "Thank God for Uncle Tomism" kind of things either. You know, they've been important changes. It's not constructive in the sense that they've just been quiet; I think they have brought some changes to the University and to themselves that have been very good.

I just wish, as a matter of fact, that the other ethnic groups on campus had done as well, and were as well organized. The American Indian Organization, for example, dealing with a much more complex problem as far as their membership is concerned, has not been very effective, and the Asian American

Alliance has not been very effective. Again, it's a more complex, less homogeneous kind of group of people, but it's just too bad that these other groups have not been as strong or as effective as the BSU, even though the BSU, even at its height, has never had membership that equaled half the black student population on the campus. There is, you know, the same kind of apathy that students have about ASUN elections or anything else. Twenty-five or thirty students is a big meeting for the BSU, with a range of seventy-five to a hundred black students on campus. They have the same kind of human problems that the rest of us have, but they have been very effective.

Some of the important leaders on the campus, too, I think, —a few of them— have been among the black students, using the route of the BSU initially—to get into leadership positions. Stan Davis is one of them, Ivy Sloan, George Cotton, this year and last, Alex Boyd when he was a student here. It's been a way for some of these people to get the kind of visibility that being a president of a fraternity sometimes gives to a white student, and so it's served a good purpose in that sense, too.

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT

Of course, a public institution by its nature, has a daily public relations kind of situation, and problem. [Partly this] deals with some of the mechanical ways of dealing with the public relations problem, but prior to that, the basic public relations is what goes on at a university, and how that is communicated by the people at the university.

The best public relations program I can conceive of is a good teacher in a classroom with bright students, who don't mind talking about that kind of situation to their parents, to their friends, to other students. You know, you don't need an information officer to get at that kind of thing. But conversely, the worst kind of public relations is when you have a less than desirable classroom situation, with unfortunate kinds of things happening in the classroom, things that by most acceptable standards should not happen in a classroom, and that's been the heart of some of the public relations problems that the University's had, because word gets out from that little core of where public relations really start. And unfortunately, the bad kinds of situations are

the ones that attract the attention. Students can talk endlessly about what a fine professor they have in a class. That probably in the public eye, is accepted as the norm; that's the way it ought to be. And therefore, it's not newsworthy, in a sense. But if something untoward happens in the classroom, that is newsworthy, and it deviates from the norm so much, that it creates some problems. So I guess what I'm saying is that everybody in a university community is in a very personal and direct way involved in a public relations program.

The point is, though, that I think all of us, and not just administrators and not just faculty, but students too, everyone around here is involved in developing the images and concepts about what the university is like, and they communicate these images and concepts to the public. But because that involves about ten thousand people, it does need some kind of focus, and some way of telling a story that has more direction than ten thousand people can give it. And that's why institutions, not just universities, tend to have information

officers or public relations staffs, or whatever they might be called.

But they're really transmitters. They don't make public relations, [or] images and concepts. They simply are communicators about what is happening. Sometimes they become communicators of reasons, or explanations, or arguments, perhaps. At this university, we don't have a big public relations staff like many institutions do. As a matter of fact, we get criticism about the small staff we have, and in this state, I think, this kind of thing is not viewed with great enthusiasm. Our staff in this area is Ed Olsen presently, who is three-quarter time for this University as information director.

Sam Basta is director of community relations. His job is becoming more and more, especially this year, more like an alumni secretary job.

The creation of this office was admittedly built around solving some other problems, as far as Sam was concerned, in the Office of Student Affairs.

Sam had been dean of students here for a good many years, maybe ten years or so, and apparently at one time, quite effective, and even in 1965, was doing a reasonably good job, but I think behind the times in terms of his notion about his job and his notion about the interests and activities of students. So one of the early problems I saw here was trying to change the leadership in the Office of Student Affairs. And some of the members of his staff felt that way, too, that we weren't keeping up with the times in that office (including incidentally, Elaine Mobley, who was of the old school but really very modern, in a great many ways).

After the first year I was here and had an opportunity to watch Sam firsthand, I counseled with him a great many times, both about the possibility of changing some ways

of doing things in the office and restructuring the office. And also about his own position in the office. It was very difficult and part of the difficulty grows out of the fact that I'm very fond of Sam as a human being, and almost any discussion about either the office and the way it operated or about his role, either was very traumatic to him if he really participated in the discussion, but more frequently, he would seem to participate, but really withdraw, you know. It's like saying, "You didn't hear a word I said" kind of thing. I think that was true, that the kind of strange discussions—I don't think he wanted to talk about this kind of thing, and so he didn't.

I had asked him about 1966 or '67 to undertake a thorough study of the office and the roles of people in the office, kinds of functions they performed and what we should be doing with students. And that, you know, didn't get off the ground at all. That's part of what I mean, that I don't think he took this seriously. So it was really about 1968, '69 or thereabouts before a study like this really got under way. It was only by my meeting with the whole staff on two or three occasions and then their putting pressure on him to get it done, that we spent almost a full year, the staff of the office with some outside consultants, doing a major study about who they were and what they were doing.

Sam found this, I'm sure, very traumatic and was ill a lot that year and missed a lot of work and I think it's—you know—I don't think it was the flu, although he had the symptoms of the flu often, but just doing a self-analysis was very difficult for him. I mean, a self-analysis of the staff.

The kinds of conclusions we drew from this involved some major changes, some of them symbolic only. For example, the positions of dean of men and dean of women, they recommended that we eliminate those

titles and reorganize along functional lines. And this is the kind of result I hoped they'd come up with. We began doing this as best we could, because some people held the positions so I did not—I guess this was probably the year after Dean Mobley left, retired. Jim Hathorne was dean of men and was on leave the year when most of the study was done. And just as a case in point, I didn't want to slap at him on his return that he now was an assistant dean of students, or something of the sort. But he left in a year, and so as these became possible, we made the changes. And it was more than the change in titles. I think some of the kinds of functions were changed. We used to have two people who virtually spent all their time, one with sororities and one with fraternities. Now this is really a very minor part of what goes on in the office.

This is not the occasion to go into that whole study, and I'm getting off on a tangent about it. But it became then very clear that the style of leadership that Sam had given to the office was not appropriate for this new approach; including, you know, the recommendation which will go to the Board of Regents this March meeting, as a matter of fact, finally, that the name of the office be changed to Student Services, instead of Student Affairs. Students have their own affairs without our encouraging them. They need services occasionally.

So Sam and I had begun then some very serious talks about his future. He would not, understandably, give consideration to (and I didn't push this) a different status in the revision of that staff. I could see the enormous problems for him personally and moving from the top administrative position into let's say a counselor's position. It wouldn't work, really. And this was the year before and the year of the first major disturbances on campus, the year of Governor's Day and all that. And we

were having then some great problems in communicating to the people of the state what really happened, that buildings weren't blown up and that people weren't fighting each other physically. So I had talked to Sam earlier and talked to him again, and he began to warm up to the idea of being a kind of public relations person—community relations—to be active in Reno, downtown, and around the state help carry the University story. Events had made the job not a kind of amorphous thing, but a very real job with a real problem to tackle right now. So it was with some reluctance, but nonetheless, this is what he's moved into. It was and I'm sure still is, kind of a painful thing for him, that he views himself as being, you know, "Dean Sam," the dean of students on the campus. As a matter of fact he was curiously insistent, really, that he keep the title of dean. That's why we have the curious kind of *director* of community relations being a *dean* of community relations, because he likes to be called "Dean Sam."

Students, incidentally, had been pushing harder than anyone to get this change made. I think from about Ernie Maupin on in the chronology of ASUN presidents that I've gone over earlier, every student officer, while they all liked Sam very much, didn't see him functioning well in this job.

At any rate, he's, I think, done very well. He's very popular in many of the rural communities of the state. He's a former student here in the manner of what I would describe as coming as near a typical student who had—he was an ATO, when he was an undergraduate. He was an athlete. He's the kind that I hear a lot about, "That's the way it used to be, and that's the way it ought to be now," kind of thing. So he has all the credentials, and the people of his generation who were in school with him, or around that time, all knew him. And he has great rapport

with them. They can reminisce for hours together, tell stories on each other. And then he basically was popular with students as a dean of students, and so there is a group of alumni, covering about a fifteen-year period in more recent times, who, you know, think he's a very fine person and who are always glad to see him. So going with him, as I have frequently, to a place like Gardnerville or Fallon, and to a Rotary meeting or whatever else, and see the kind of magic he has still with people in communities like that, makes it very clear that he can do us a lot of good, and I think he has. From the beginning though, I viewed this position, hopefully, as one that could be a kind of alumni field secretary out in the state and in the nation, and work with chapters, if we ever got 'em started, and help get 'em started.

Since he's been in that job, presidents of the alumni association have been very cool to this idea, until this year. Paul Havas thinks it's a very fine idea, and it is a good way for them to get a lot of help for free. And it will accomplish the University's purpose much better if he has this kind of strong tie-in with the alumni. So this year he's turning his attention heavily to the alumni association.

Ed Olsen is the chief person responsible for telling our story as a professional, and making contacts with the news media, and in my opinion, remarkably successful at this. He knows so many people in the news media, and the new ones that come along like him immediately, and respect him. With the little resources we've put into this, I think we are very blessed indeed to have this man with us. His judgment is, in my opinion, always so good about things. I probably feel as close to Ed as I do to anyone on the campus, and have sought his advice about a greater variety of things than I have anyone else on the campus, and, you know, he's basically not a university

person, but he's a very sensible human being. He's talked me out of some things that I think I should have been talked out of, and he has supported me in some other things where I have felt I needed some support. So I'm getting off, too, but as a friend, and as a confidant he's about as close as anybody on the campus. I think he probably knows more about what I do and why, than anyone [else]. And I don't mean to say, and he would agree, that I try to push anything off on him. When I seek his advice, I don't always follow it. I think he's wrong sometimes, but it is also very good to have someone whose judgment you respect to test an idea on, even if he doesn't agree. But that's getting off the subject.

I think he does a first-rate job in every respect, as far as I'm concerned. I don't have any dissatisfactions at all about his job, the way he does it. When we need to get a message to the press, or to the media generally, and I ask him to do it, it gets done. And we don't do this too often because I don't want to abuse this kind of thing, but, right after the Governor's Day events, I asked him if he could arrange some time on television for Frankie Sue and me, to talk, you know, to try to play down the hysteria that was kind of sweeping the city about this. And within an hour all three television stations had sent mobile units to this office and Frankie Sue and I made pleas for calm, directed to students and to townspeople, and—you know, no problem at all. He could get this kind of rather expensive (to a television station) cooperation. And I don't mean to say that he—you know the press—that he can influence the press. I think that's impossible. But they respect him. They listen to him.

I have tried, with respect to the news media, to keep in close touch with them personally, and I think I know them all. The new editor of the *Journal* I have not met yet,

but Ed and I will have lunch with him some day soon. For example, several years ago when Warren Lerude was the editor of the *Gazette*, I asked him if he and I could make a deal. I'd like to have him, I said, someday, spend a day in my office, just sitting and listening and seeing what goes on. And that I'd also like to spend a day in the press room. And I did that part of it. Warren and I have tried several times to free a day for him to come here, and of course, he's no longer editor, but I did spend a day at the *Gazette*, and watched, you know, from six in the morning until two-thirty in the afternoon, and watched everything happen. With Paul Leonard, who was editor of the *Journal*, I didn't do that, but kept in very close touch with him, and with the television people, too. Radio people, with a few exceptions, KOH and KOLO, are the two exceptions. The others I've not really done much with; so many of them tend to be disk jockey kinds of operations, and everybody's important to us, but in the priority scheme of things, it'd be less important, I think, than the television and newspaper people.

Do you ever feel that there's a problem of overexposure? You can pick up a newspaper some nights and there's fifteen stories about everything from the most important to the most trivial.

Yes. I think there is too much of that. It's even worse, in a way, with three television stations. This city really isn't big enough for three television stations. And their news departments, for a while, until KCRL cut back on their news coverage—local news coverage—all three of them were competing so heavily with each other for news that there was a real tendency to create news. The most glaring example was year before last in the fall, that is to say the fall of 1971,

at registration time, one of the two days of registration, I walked over to the Union for a luncheon meeting, and there was the crew from one of the three television stations interviewing students on a kind of "man on the street" interview. And the question they were posing to students was, "When do you think the trouble this year will start?" So it was an inciting kind of question to ask, and—that's what I mean, that often they're inventing things. And the press does this some too. The *Gazette* varies some with who the education reporter is, but just recently the *Gazette* had a coup—for two or three days in one week, big front page lead stories—you know, the box across the top of the page. One of them, I recall, was about the crime wave on the campus, and there's no crime wave. That week's—or that month's—whatever they were reporting on—petty thefts and occasional vandalism kind of thing—was like any other month, and like any other community of ten thousand people would have. But it's that kind of thing, that kind of overexposure, yes, I think that does us a lot of harm. The two examples that I mentioned bring [that] out. And I think the overexposure generally, on properly newsworthy items, can have a mildly negative kind of effect in the sense that people get tired of reading about it, and then when you want them to read something, you know, you've jaded the palate on this. Often their discrimination about what we, at least, feel is important and unimportant, doesn't appear, and it's all kind of tossed into the same bag. I don't know what the right midpoint on this is, of not having enough news, because on the other hand, sometimes we have something important happening that doesn't show up—the press coverage—important in our opinion.

One kind of overexposure that does concern me a good deal, and that is, I think

very often I get in the newspapers too much, and on television too much, and I don't think that does any good. I don't like to be in the newspapers and television. I'm delighted when, like the last three or four weeks, I'm not quoted about anything, no pictures in the paper, and that sort of thing. But I also think, you know, it's good occasionally to have other people who are doing the things on the campus get the credit for it, and not everything come from here. So there is that kind of overexposure, that I truly don't care for. I am very pleased when I can be as anonymous as possible, except occasionally, I think it's very important that the president of the University be heard on something. So I'm not making a blanket kind of thing, but when a thousand-dollar gift for a golf scholarship is given to the University, I don't think I always need to have my picture taken in accepting the check, you know; no reason why the golf coach can't do it, or the director of athletics, or whatever. It's that kind of thing. But there are other occasions, like, you know, I ask for television time to talk about Governor's Day, and I should have. You know, there are times—so I'm not talking about the important thing, but the social and trivial, in a way, kind of things.

How do you feel about managing the news?

I don't think it's possible. And I'm never quite sure I understand what managing the news means, because the minute you set up an information office, you are involved in managing the news, because that means that there's selectivity about what goes out from that office, at least. But if you mean, do I think we should manage the news in the sense of trying to hide something, or to build something up beyond what the news people feel it should built up, you know the fluff kind of thing, then, no, I don't.

I have very strong feelings that we're a public institution and what we do here is public, and ought to be public. We should be accountable to the people of this state. So I don't think we have any right to try to hide what goes on. I think there are some things that properly are not the press's business, or the public's business at a particular point in time. Like when something is in the process. You know, I'm going to appear before your committee sometime soon, and I think that's an in-house kind of thing, and I'm not sure I'd fight the press being there, but I don't think it's appropriate to have the press involved in a consultative kind of situation. What comes out of it ought to be completely public information, and we should be held accountable. You know, be able to justify what we're doing. So I'm not saying everything should be open—and clearly things that would damage people, and the press recognizes this too; there's no problem about personnel kinds of things.

I don't know whether I've answered your question or not, but we do have to be accountable to our public, and our public really is all the people in the state.

One thing, before we leave the public relations and press, maybe a comment about the *Sagebrush* would be in order too. More than one comment, I guess [laughs].

In this sense, too, we've been more lucky than people in the University community and regents and people in the state think, because our *Sagebrush*, our student newspaper has been less inclined to the radicalism that has really hit a lot of student newspapers. Apparently student newspapers attract as members of editorial staffs, people who are impatient about change, and we got some of that on our student newspaper staff. The only other two student newspapers that I've

ever read on a regular basis are the *Michigan Daily* and the *Daily Texan*, both of which were, even in the quiet days, more radical than the *Sagebrush* has been in recent years here. But despite that, I get a lot of complaints from regents, and a lot of complaints from the general public about the *Sagebrush*. Every time a four-letter word appears in the *Sagebrush*, you can count on my hearing about it from two or three regents, and not always, but unusually a dozen letters or phone calls from people who have seen it. Any four-letter word [laughs] almost, you know. And that seems to bother them, incidentally; the language seems to bother them more than the ideas. The *Sagebrush* has on occasion published a nude or semi-nude female picture of a female, and that's brought the house down! And you know, the complaints on campus about the *Sagebrush* often are that it's not a very vital newspaper. Now it's a different set of complaints. I'm sure that students and faculty would welcome a lot more four-letter words if along with it came a good deal more vitality in the paper, and I think it could use more vitality, I think it's one of those things where, you know, every issue, I'm delighted on the one hand that there are no problems in it, [laughs] and on the other hand I'm disappointed because it isn't really doing the kind of thing that I think a student newspaper ought to do, and that is to keep a university community alert to things in that community and in its areas of concern. The only kind of crusading that they do [is] when they get wrapped up in the food service at the dining commons. And, okay, so a story once a year about that criticizing it, is fine, but a whole series on that when there's so many other important things that ought to be talked about on this campus in a student newspaper.

My relationship with editors of the *Sagebrush* generally has been good. Some

of them, I think, have been very bright, intelligent people, and have done their best with the *Sagebrush*. It's partly a reflection of the kind of student body we have, you know, let's face it. Like any newspaper, they in part are giving the public what the public wants.

But the *Sagebrush* creates problems for us in public relations out in the state. And I've been asked many times why I don't do this, that or the other with the *Sagebrush*. Usually what this means is why don't we censor that, have a faculty member edit it, I guess—faculty member who's conservative.

I think their taste is often not very good. You know, it always irritates me to see a four-letter word just for the sake of having a four-letter word. That's what I mean about the taste. Or to print a nude picture as a way of challenging the system. That's juvenile, and not in very good taste. That, That, too often, is the way these things come in the *Sagebrush*.

Just a little bit about the office of development. When I came here, Charlie Russell had, I guess, been on the job for maybe a year. I'm not sure. He was director of development. When I came, I think, very unjustly accused of not, you know, just not doing anything. He didn't do much, but I don't think really it was his fault. No one around here, it seemed to me, had really given much thought to any kind of program or plan or concept about development. I recall discussing this with Charlie Armstrong on a good many occasions, and wrote him several very long memoranda (and I don't like to write long memoranda), you know, about some things that maybe we ought to be concerning ourselves with in the area of development. And in talking to Charlie Russell, he's a very kind person, and you know, would not really explicitly say what the problem was, so maybe I'm reading into it my

own thoughts. But I don't think anyone was giving him any direction, and I don't think he felt he had the authority to do it himself. I think he had some abilities that just weren't used, and so it must have been a painful kind of existence for him. He really wasn't doing very much, but you know, how do you get out of that kind of box, really?

When he retired, Charlie Armstrong was still president, and he hired a young man named Ray Finehout, who had been in Washington with the National Council of Alumni Associations, whatever that organization is, and had had maybe one or two years kind of staff experience in fund raising at an eastern university. Ray had a great many personal problems and ended up just about a year ago, not long after he left here, in a very tragic death. He was killed and his body was found badly beaten, and—. But he had a lot of personal kinds of problems. I thought he was a very nice young man, but the kind of person who would be viewed as a city slicker type here. He was energetic and full of ideas, but they were the Syracuse University kind of ideas, you know, or Columbia University, or Dartmouth College kind of ideas, and not the kinds of things this state would cater to or that this University could get away with. He stayed a year, and then during that year, Charlie Armstrong left, and at the end of the year, I asked Ray to leave. My notion about the first step that we needed in terms of development at this University was something that Charlie Russell could have done superbly, and that was to build some good fences with the wealthy in this community. And I felt we needed that more than we needed someone who could, you know, write proposals and the kinds of things that development officers need to do.

Bob Reams was working at DRI then, and Wendell Mordy was very unhappy with him.

I talked to Wendell about the possibility of Bob Reams doing this. Bob knew some people in town, and came as close as anyone—after Charlie Russell—I knew of, to being able to cultivate, in a good sense of the word, people like Ed Manville, Jay Bergin, some of the people that had some interest in the University, but had never really been, you know, made to feel a part of the University family. I've got a lot of criticism about Bob Reams, and I know he has too, as being a kind of do-nothing person, but not in my book, because he's done what I wanted done. And this is his last year with us, and we'll make some changes now in the office. I think we've established relationships through him—not through him totally. As I mentioned earlier, public relations (and that's what this—what I'm talkin' about now) is everybody's job. And I've been involved in this very heavily, too. But, you know, we had someone who focused on that. I'm very well pleased with what he's done. He's not been the vigorous, hyperkinetic Ray Finehout, by any means, and I'm not sure that he's done it as well as Charlie Russell could have done ten years ago, but it's that kind of thing. It was a deliberate program of action, and maybe it wasn't the right one for the University but I thought so, and so that's why we did it that way.

We now are going to turn attention to a move vigorous asking-for-money kind of thing. I think we've got our fences well-mended and we'll keep them that way now. But we're now going to hold our hand out, not for a handshake, but with the palm up [gesture] from now on [laughs]. With the centennial coming so close, with the change in that office, this works out beautifully, the timing on this. I probably will use Bob Hill in a large way. He retires from the Army this year and I'm trying to give him some crash training. He's of f to meetings and training sessions and this sort

of thing, and has the kind of energy and vigor, and knows a lot of people again in the state, and is well-respected by them. Including the group that he calls “110 percent Americans.” He knows them and they like him. He also has been a remarkably unusual professor of military science for any college campus, and in our dark days, if we’d had someone else as a colonel here, we really could have had some serious problems, but we’ve really not had much anti-ROTC-as-such flak (I think I’ve talked about that) largely because of his leadership in these times. So he’s the kind of guy that I think, if he can get the technical skills, and he’s working on that this year, [that] he’ll serve this University very well.

Part of my problem with this area is that I don’t know very much about it myself, very little about it, and I’m not very good at asking for, you know, directly asking for money, and I don’t know how to tell people to do this well. So I find myself sometimes in a kind of criticizing-after-the-fact way, rather than being able to plan well for it. But I do feel the importance of having some goal in mind, and I don’t think we had that before. Maybe my goals are too modest, or inappropriate, or whatever, but at least we do have some goals in this area.

I spent a lot of time in this development area, too. I have asked people for money, and successfully, and unsuccessfully too. And I do know of two or three wills now that say some nice things about the University, and they should bring ultimately some good payoff at the University, growing out of the kind of program—if program’s the right word—but the kind of goal I had in this last four or five years. And that’s another feature of development.

You so rarely see the direct cause-effect thing that, it’s a long time off and very often, it’s the kind of thing that can’t be influenced.

It’s like the dealings, with the friend, the man who gave us the thousand dollars recently,* you know. “Out of a clear blue sky” kind of thing. If you go a complete cycle, it all comes back to what happens to people while they’re on campus, which becomes very important indeed. That’s the best kind of development in public relations program. All we can do is just expedite with experts, and people who can tell us when we’re doing something right or wrong in their opinion.

*E. B. Wolford

LEGISLATIVE LOBBYING AND INTER-AGENCY RELATIONS

I think I commented before in passing about some relationships with the governor's office. I think the chief comment I made was that in this state, the nearness of people to the governor [is remarkable]. I think that's probably especially true for people who occupy what in state government parlance I understand is called "state agency head positions" or whatever they call them. The University is different, because it's a constitutionally separate arm of government, and we do not report to the governor, like a highway department would, or prison, or some other unit. There is a kind of a close relationship in terms of function between any of the state agencies in this state, I think, and the governor's office. My relationship and the relationship of this campus with the governor's office has been generally good, but with quite a notable exception of two years ago when Governor O'Callaghan first came—his first year in office. It's my impression that he became very angry at—primarily at me, because of some things that I'd said about the appropriation recommendation he had made

and the appropriation we finally got from the legislature. He's never indicated that to me, any anger, and so our personal contacts have been friendly, but not close. We speak to each other, and cordially.

The problem grew out of the appropriation for higher education in 1971. It was about seventeen or eighteen percent above the appropriation of two years before, for all of higher education in this state. And this was fine, but [for] two things about this. One was that a large amount of this increase was earmarked for community college development—the community colleges were brand new—and, you know, it should have been earmarked that way. And the other thing is the technical way in which appropriations are made for higher education in the state; that is to say, by means of about fourteen or fifteen separate bills, separate pieces of appropriation legislation. And therefore, by law, nobody can change the appropriation for Unit One to, you know, give part of it to Unit Two. The appropriation for instruction on this campus, for example, which is in the

neighborhood of about twelve million dollars a year, can be used only for this campus and only for the kinds of things associated with instruction and support activities—student services and a variety of other things

At the same time, under my jurisdiction, as the president of this campus, there are several other line appropriations. There's a separate appropriation for Ag Extension, and a separate appropriation for the Experiment Station, another one for state-wide services, and so on. There are about seven or eight of these associated with the University. And we can't shift funds among these; they're separate bills. Nor can the Board of Regents take money from this campus and give it to Las Vegas or take money from the Community College Division and give it here. In my opinion, the point of dispute arose over the fact that while the appropriation for higher education totally was quite good, for this campus it was not good, particularly for instruction and that whole area. The reason it was not good was because we had proposed that the allocation of funds for instruction be based on a student-faculty ratio of about 18.5 full-time students to 1 faculty member, with an ultimate goal after 8 years of a 20 to 1 ratio. The concept was one that the governor's office and the legislature accepted, but instead of phasing into the 20 to 1 ultimate goal, we were asked to do it immediately. And the difference between 18.5 and 20 presented to us a very bleak financial picture. It meant in fact, the reduction of the number of authorized faculty we had been having on the campus. We had to cut back.

I called a faculty meeting to explain to the faculty what our appropriation was like and what kind of impact it would have, that we were in fact in a critical biennium. Both years would be bad. You can't do this kind of thing without it getting into the newspapers,

and in a big enough way to catch the eye of the governor. The governor, I understand, became angry then, that I was complaining about a poor appropriation when in fact the appropriation had gone up seventeen or eighteen percent. In my opinion, he didn't see the problem associated with not being able to shift funds, and that a unit, receiving its own appropriation, could be very good or could be very bad within that total framework and nothing could be done about it. So relationships were kind of cool, despite being cordial in social situations. I hasten to say though, that it now appears at this point in time that his recommendations for next year for us—for the next biennium—are much better, and the relationship seems to be a good one now. He seemed to have recovered a good feeling about the University.

Governor O'Callaghan is a different kind of governor from any that I've had contact with, and certainly the two Nevada governors I've had contact with. One of the things that he mentioned to several people—not to me, because we were not on that kind of close basis—was that one reason we didn't fare better was because we didn't put enough pressure on him early enough. We didn't have the kind of lobby that public school teachers had, for example. A group of faculty wives went to see him after he had made his recommendation, while the legislature was dealing with this, and apparently there was a long discussion with him. I think he did not take well to that. Among other things, he apparently felt it was too late to do this kind of lobbying at that point in time. Several members of the faculty had campaigned for him actively, and were good friends of his, and it's through them, primarily, that I know about his feeling that we should have campaigned harder with him sooner. This year, we took him at his word and the chancellor, who is

the official lobbyist with the governor's office and the legislature for all of us, met with the governor, discussed with him how he would like to be approached this time. He indicated he did want to hear from faculty, and students, and faculty wives, too, but how about putting them all together at one time and one place. And so this is what we did. When we met with him about our budget this year, there was a team of about fourteen or fifteen people, including faculty members and students and the usual administrative groups, and a representative from the citizens' advisory committee, and a faculty wife—the president of the Faculty Wives' group. And we all talked. And I think it was a good session, I think it made some impact. We'll know Friday, but apparently we got some more money as a result of this session. Much different, incidentally, than from the first session two years ago we had with him, much more cordial.

In the past, governors have liked to have us work primarily through their staffs, through the budget office in particular, and make a kind of pro forma presentation in a governor's hearing on budget. But Governor O'Callaghan is a much more direct person, did his own lobbying in the last session of the legislature, for example, is frequently seen in the legislative hall, which would [be] virtually unheard of, either Laxalt or Sawyer. [He] apparently wanted this more direct kind of contact with our people, but at a better timing and in a more thought-out way than we did it before.

I'm not sure, to do it over again, how I could do anything differently than to try to explain to the people who have to live with this situation what they have to live with, but it apparently was something that irritated him a great deal. I don't know, I think I'd still do it the same way.

Talking about governors, Governor Laxalt was extremely helpful to us in a very quiet and indirect way with securing legislative approval for the Medical School. For understandable political reasons, he could not be an open advocate for us. The Las Vegas sentiment was so strong, and this was when his own political future may still have been in his mind in doubt, I don't know. We understood that he couldn't come out openly and speak for us, but he was very, very useful in contacts with the Hughes people, and by quiet and informal talks with members of the legislature. The interest shown by direct close members of his staff, like Bill Sinnott, for example, who did not mind consorting with those of us who were there openly to lobby for the Medical School, you know. He would invite us to use his office as a base, and he talked to legislators, obviously with the governor's approval. So in a behind-the-scenes kind of way but very effective, the governor did help in that instance, a great deal.

On the budget situation, and what I'm about to say, I think, follows through the governor and the legislature too. The bulk of the work really is done at a staff level in the budget office in the governor's office. It's there that we go over item by item, and line by line. The budget officer in the chancellor's office usually carries that responsibility. The budgets have been developed on campus and fully explained and approved by the Board of Regents, so it's my budget, but the communication job about it is primarily with Don Jessup, or whoever the budget officer is in the chancellor's office.

I get involved in this only as questions arise in the budget office. You know, "How can you further justify x-number of dollars for more books, or x-number of dollars for this, that or the other." And it's primarily questions that Don brings back to me, and then I answer

to him, and then he takes back down. So that process goes on, literally, for months in a very close working relationship. It's a big budget for the state, and they spend a lot of time with it.

When we meet with the governor, or with the legislative money committees, by then they have the end result of all of that. The governor's had the documents and had, I'm sure, briefing sessions with his own staff on this. So in a budget session with the governor, what I would tend to focus on are either the kinds of things that by the questions that had been asked, seemed to be kind of shaky, or the kinds of things where there have been suggested cut-backs that would not seem appropriate to me. Sometimes the cut-backs suggested are so minor that, you know, why take time to talk about that, since ultimately we can shift the money anyway. But if a whole program is cut out, that kind of thing, to find the trouble spots and talk about them, or the things that, even if treated well, sometimes you want to reinforce in order that, along the line, they don't get hurt. And every presentation that I have ever made, for example, I always, whether I need to or not, in terms of how it's coming up, talk about the library. This is a kind of thing that must be constantly maintained, and, you know, even if there's no major crisis apparent, it's still worth mentioning, that we've got to keep the flow of new books and periodicals and services in operation in a library. And the same thing for the money committees. A lot of it is by ear, and replying to questions. I think I mentioned earlier in the last session, in the senate finance committee at least, many of the questions I got really were not about budget, but about things that had been going on on campus, and so you try to deal with these in as diplomatic and yet firm way as you can.

I firmly believe that the best single guiding principle is brevity. I don't believe that they

want to hear infinitely detailed presentations, or long-winded justifications. I believe in trying to keep it as much to the point as possible, but as brief as possible.

How do the legislators react to you when you have tried to establish a rapport with say, a chairman of a finance committee, or something? Do they ever give you tips on how you ought to be lobbying their colleagues or, as Governor O'Callaghan did, tell you when you ought to make your approach, and how you ought to make it?

Yes, and I think somehow or other you learn who you can say what to, and what kind of timing is appropriate. Maybe some of this is conveyed by direct statement, but I don't recall someone saying, "Now look, don't talk to me now. Talk to me three weeks from now about this." I would not get two or three senators, for example, off to one side to go over the budget without—. The way would to do this—unless they asked for it—the way you'd do this would be to tell them to come to the senate finance committee meeting, because Senator Lamb, I think, would not very much appreciate rump sessions about the budget. And that's the kind of perception that has developed.

Maybe I'm subconsciously hiding, but I don't recall ever being given explicit directions. My treatment by the legislature just, as far as I'm concerned, has been very good. Even the legislators that give me problems were always very kind to me and very hospitable, and I think genuinely so. I think I mentioned Senator Titlow gave us a lot of problems in the last session, but I think was, you know, always, was always genuinely very nice to me. Maybe he appreciated the fact that I was giving him some good political fodder [laughs]. And Senator Slattery, who has on at least one occasion on the floor of

the senate, labeled me “a Communist dupe” has nonetheless, you know, always been very cordial and when he was in the senate, anytime I was there and out in the corridor, would invite me to come in and sit by him, and on the floor of the senate, you know, the kind of thing. Neil Humphrey really is the chief lobbyist. One thing I try to do is not to goof—not to be there unnecessarily. I don’t go down just to be there. He is there two or three times a week during a session, as he should be.

I think it could very easily be irritating to them if others of us began just kind of hanging around. If I’m there for some other purpose, I try to go down early or stay a little later to say hello to some of the people that I know that I don’t see regularly. But I don’t spend a lot of time just to be there. So usually, when I’m down there, it’s primarily for some business reason. Which means after the session gets well under way, I probably go down about once a week for something or other. And we have more legislative things than the budget, of course. So things will come up, bills will be introduced that we hadn’t even heard about, and that sort of thing.

Well, maybe you’d like to talk about some of the other lobbying-type chores you mentioned. Some other legislative agencies, like city councils, and county commissions, and boards of health, and—.

We get involved with a lot of these. Well, a good case in point was the dealings in 1965 and ’66 about Stead, which was a multi-governmental kind of involvement. The county and the city and the University were all greatly interested and concerned about this, and we did spend a good deal of time—I spent time, and Jim Anderson, who was, before I came, Dean of the College of

Engineering, had been designated kind of as University spokesman on this, and had been working with them. But we spent a good deal of time both behind the scenes and publicly, with Mayor Quilici; Roy Bankofier was the city man, doing the kind of thing that Jim was; and with some members of the county commission and with C. B. Kinnison, who was the county administrator then.

We have problems that are kind of constant potential problems that we keep in close touch with city people on. The police and fire departments. I try to know well the sheriff and chief of police, not because of the kind of one occasion we’ve had them on campus, but by the nature of having a community of very young people, who are new with their own freedoms. You know, there’s a lot of downtown involvement of students, there always has been and there always will be. And they’re as eager as we are to minimize the kind of retributive kinds of things about students, so the better we understand each other, and the better kind of relationship we have, the better it is for our students and for everyone concerned. I’m not saying we’re getting law breakers off scot-free, but I think attitudes are important on this kind of thing.

And with the fire department, we have a constant problem, because of the propensity of students in Nye Hall to pull false alarms. It costs something in the neighborhood of five hundred to a thousand dollars for the fire department to answer a false alarm, and they get fed up with it understandably. And we do too, because we, you know, live in fear that they’re going to either say, “We won’t answer any more” (and we can’t have that kind of situation, because no matter how many false alarms, someday there may be a real one), or that we’ll have to shell out \$25,000 a year or something as repayment for fire protection.

And with the highway department, and with the street and traffic engineer of the city, and with zoning commissions—. We own a lot of property, and anytime zoning changes are proposed in property that's around us, we, of course, want to give our own consideration to how we want to react to that. It's not like the state when you have a particular point in time and a major thing, like a budget that you're working with, but it's a question of keeping in close touch with people. And we try to do this. No big thing. It seems very important to me—it's really a kind of public relations thing, in a way, but it sometimes becomes a negotiating kind of thing, too. A business kind of thing.

One of the things that you mentioned as a negotiating type of thing was with the State Board of Education, and teacher certification problems, and all that sort of thing. How do you work with them?

We get along very well with them. The teacher certification part of it, I'm just kind of aware of, because our College of Education and the College of Education at Las Vegas, the professionals there, the deans and members of the faculty, do most of that kind of contact. But I get involved in a peripheral way on that kind of thing, but more directly on certain other kinds of things. For example, much of the federal money that goes into certain kinds of special education program[s] or special kinds of teacher training program[s], is funneled from Washington to Carson City, and from the state department to the University. So we deal with several people in the state department of education about receiving our share of federal funds on programs for—oh, training teachers and others in certain kinds of technical skills—shop teachers, or ag teachers, or whatever

else. Certain kinds of federal loan moneys that our students are entitled to, again, the money comes from Washington to the state capital, the state department of education, and back to us.

Then we use some of their staff from time to time, in advisory kinds of positions for us, as we talk about new programs for teachers of mechanic arts, for example. We serve on some of their advisory groups. I've been a member of a Title III citizens advisory group for the state department until about a year ago, for four or five years, some elementary and secondary education funding programs.

The relationship is fairly constant, primarily with the College of Education. I had lunch and spent two or three hours in the afternoon with the new state superintendent, for example, just a couple of weeks ago. Just mostly to get acquainted with him.

Do you enjoy making these contacts, and keeping them up, and continually keeping the University's story in focus with them?

Yes, I do. The only problem I have is that I'm really not a very good manager of time. I can't fit all these things into the right kind of priorities. And I must confess that my first preference is to be right here, on campus, and preferably out of this office. I enjoy nothing more than what I do about once a month, and that is when I have a free hour, wander off to a building and say hello to faculty and students. Maybe that's just a holiday kind of thing, but I really enjoy working with these people. I like people, and I like to talk about the University, and do everything to move it, move it ahead. But sometimes the time problem.

I had hoped, for example, between election time and the opening of the [legislative] session, to spend some time with every senator and representative from this county.

Well, I, you know, managed to get to about half of them and that's all. I tried to pick the new ones. So I have some time problems, in doing enough of this. But I enjoy it.

Is there anything you don't like about it, besides the time and scheduling situation?

Yes, I guess there are two or three kind of minor things I don't like. Because I always feel the pressure of time, I don't like the waiting, and that's often a part of it, particularly with the legislature. I mentioned earlier going down for a meeting scheduled at nine o'clock and then having it happen at two in the afternoon. I find that very frustrating, even though I take advantage of it to talk to people, and so on. But it's still very frustrating. I keep thinking about planned things that I could be doing with that much time.

I also sometimes get irritated with occasional duplicity of people who tell me one thing in private and then something else about the same thing in public, and I've referred to a case in point on that. That irritates me and I don't know why— either why people do that, or what I've done wrong in telling people, you know, or talking with them that the message either didn't get across or that I was being used in some fashion.

Most of the people though, that I've had contact with, I find interesting people. I wouldn't choose them all as my best friends, and I wouldn't choose them all as people I'd want to spend ten hours traveling across country with. But because I think, I've commented before, people in this state are a friendly type [laughs] and there're very few people that I don't want to be around very much. So there's an element of personal satisfaction in seeing them, but if I can also strike a good word or two for the University in the process, this is good.

And, you know, I'm really quite interested in some of the kinds of associated things. This committee, this advisory committee I was on for the state Department of Education, their funding was primarily to put seed money in with the hope of developing exemplary or new innovative kinds of programs in the public schools, at the elementary and secondary levels. And I found this very interesting, the great variety of things, some of them not innovative at all, but others that were interesting. So I kind of look forward to school visits and talking, reading proposals, and that sort of thing on this.

It's just the time involvement thing, I think, that bothers me most, in trying to structure some priorities to get the things done that I really feel have to get done.

Do you think that people expect too much out of the president of the University in these various kinds of advocacy situations?

I don't really think so. I think they sometimes have an unreasonable expectation—that I know in detail everything about everything at the University, and that obviously is not so. I do try very hard to keep informed, and I'm rarely caught by surprise by a topic, but I often, you know, can no more than recognize that this is something that, yes, I have heard about, or know a little about. But most people are also quite tolerant if you tell them this, and tell them that you will follow through, or will let them know. And then do it. That's fine. I think it's a terrible mistake to tell them you will do it and then not do it. They'll remember, even if you don't. I think that's the one thing that they—and this is true of the public in general; that plus, you know, expecting me to know everything about the University, plus the second expectation is one I think I've mentioned before. Expecting the

president of the University to be able to do something about, and the *something about* is whatever that person wants done; you know, about anything that comes up, no matter how complex it is. And no matter how much I might understand or try to explain that power is not central in any social institution including the Army, and certainly not in a university. But there are people who—you know—like today at lunch, when I got a complaint because prices had gone up on sandwiches. And what am I gonna do about it? You know, literally that is.

This is partly, I think, the smallness of the University and partly the smallness of the state, and partly because people don't know who else to ask something, or tell, to blow off steam to. But it's that other kind of thing, and that shows up with these political groups as well as with private individuals.

Those are the only two things, I think, where expectations sometimes are beyond what r think they ought to be.

Does your social life get involved in these lobbying or advocacy roles?

When we have cocktail parties or dinners occasionally, we include people that hold one of the kinds of local or state political offices. Many of them are good friends. Sometimes there are people that we don't know well, and that's one way to get to know them. Sometimes it's part of how I see our University functioning, is that it's important to do this. Which is another way of saying, that we'd rather maybe have somebody else, but it's all right to have them, too.

I have not had big kinds of social functions. Like in the spring when the legislatures s in session, that strikes me as being rather obvious, old-fashioned lobby kind of thing that I don't personally like. I donut think I'm

trying to sell special privilege of any sort, or secure special privilege. So I haven't done that. Maybe we should, but we haven't. Some of the people from out of this county, we see during the session, but some of the people that we know and like. But we don't do that kind of special entertaining.

Social life has a lot of that in it, as it should, you know. Neither Nena nor I have any illusions about the right that we have, We don't have a right, I think, to lead our own island-kind of social life. We're employed by the University and even more in a way, I think, than most people who have connections with the University, on a kind of twenty-four hour basis. We do try to do a lot of entertaining, for the University. In a way we kind of represent the University to the community, and in this kind of thing. And that's fine. I don't have any objections to that. We've got to know a great many—literally hundreds more people than we would have if we were leading our own first-choice kind of life, in a way. And we've made a good many good friends this way. But I think that is part of my job description, really. It's another way of getting the University message across.

Since we're off on this tangent—. I don't object to this, because I think I kind of assume that in a way we're asking for it, but when we go out someplace, sometimes the last thing I want to talk about is the University. It would be great to have someone feel that they could talk to me about something else than whatever it is [laughs] at the University. But it's also, I think, you know, understandable that if you go out with townspeople, and they see you and [you can] see the wheels turning, "What kind of topic shall we talk about with the University," or they've honestly been wanting to ask something about, "How's the new basketball coach doing?" or, you know, something. It's a relief sometimes to go to a

very small dinner party with people who are aware of this kind of thing, who very kindly don't talk about the University. It's a nice change occasionally.

The biggest lobbying thing that I've been involved in was the medical school business. And we did have a great many meetings. By we, I mean the University people. Charlie Armstrong was here for part of it, and Fred Anderson and Proc Hug were the two regents most closely interested in this. Neil and George Smith and I, you know, would talk frequently about who we should talk to and what kind of approach we should take. We were greatly concerned about keeping our own forces with us, not just assuming them. And about the swing votes, the non-Las Vegas votes.

And with any group of sixty people or so, there's some that I can talk to easier than I can talk to others, and some that Neil can talk to easier than he can others, and we still do this. I've never had any problem, for example, nor has Fred Anderson, in communicating with Slats [James M. Slattery] when he was in the legislature. You know, he would always give me an audience. He often wouldn't to some others, and so I always drew the happy assignment, [laughs] on whatever matter, talking with him. And Carl Dodge and I get along very well, and I frequently am the one who will talk to Carl about something. You know, it's that kind of thing. Whereas I think the one who can come closest to Floyd Lamb, for example, might be Neil. Neil, as the head of our lobby group, his approach is not high pressure, and thank goodness. I don't believe in the high-pressure thing, and I couldn't do this. I'm not even sure I would know how to do it. And the keystone of it all is to be as honest as you can. If you don't know the answer, get it for them. But tell them you don't know. Don't make it up. And I think we do, as a group, have

real credibility with them. Because that is the way we operate. Neil is really very good at this, and his long credibility is—he was the state budget director in Sawyer's administration for several years before he came to the University, and operated that way in that position. He's that kind of person, and gained the respect of the old-timers, the ones who're old-timers now, while he was in that position. And that aura has stayed with him, as it should have. And I think we all profit by that. So from the whole System's point of view, he is a very good person to head up the lobby team.

Other than the medical school, there've been occasions when we've really had to work hard at lobbying, in the sense that I was talking about it. Getting funds for the two physical education buildings in the last session of the legislature was not easy. For this campus, and Las Vegas. It almost got into a political kind of north-south thing, and so we all worked hard at that, including Bill Morris, who really is very effective with some of the Las Vegas people, and who worked hard for the whole System on this one. And I think very effectively. We had a real lobby problem, not only with the legislature, but with the state retirement board about getting the option of TIAA for our faculty. And we worked with the retirement board first, then in order to neutralize them, so that they wouldn't take a position against it, which is what they—they wouldn't support it, but they also agreed not to fight it. And then with the legislature, they—chronically hate to see anything break out of the state retirement plan. So there've been, you know, other than budget, and the medical school, almost every session, there are two or three matters that come up that need some kind of special attention. And that's why I end up going down there more than just at budget time, and there are usually other things, too.

Do you ever have any problems with the lobbying team going off in different directions?

We did when Don Moyer was the president at Nevada Southern. He would court the legislators from Clark County, or some of them, in such a way as to really seek invitations from them for private committee sessions with him. I think *none* of us, including regents from down there, approved of this. I think it's the kind of thing that can be self-defeating, that we develop a System-wide program and we all give the same story. We don't try to push an advantage that we were unable to push with out Board of Regents in the legislature, but Don was doing this, and through the efforts of some of the regents of Clark County, it got stopped. Well, we had end-run kind of attempts occasionally from Wendell Mordy, to do it not by way of committee meetings, but by way of private conversations of his own with legislators. And once in a while, I have problems with the dean of our College of Agriculture about this. As soon as I hear about it, I right away have a talk with him and with whoever he talked with. He does not speak for [the System] in any official way. He'll answer questions—anybody around here can talk to anybody he wants to, but he's not a spokesman for the University. But I think those are the only kinds of end runs that I know of.

Well, it's my conclusion [laughs] that Wendell frequently would talk, not in the formal committee hearing, but with individual legislators, thinking, I believe, that he was making a very strong affirmative impression, and often it was a negative impression. And my conclusion is, it may have very well slowed up the flow of state funds into DRI; I don't think they were that impressed, and simply were doing nothing. Maybe this year, I think it will change.

I recall one time we had just come out of a meeting, must have been the senate finance committee on budget, on something at any rate [that] concerned the whole System. And as we all left, Floyd Lamb then came out in the corridor and called Don Moyer back in by himself. And as it turned out, he was called back in kind of indirectly by his own invitation earlier to make a special plea about something that was not in the University budget request. But you know, the committee went along with it, but leaked it back out, and so it was stopped soon. But the rest of us just stood around with our bare faces [laughs], you know, while Don went back in to plead his own special case. And he was doing essentially the same kind of thing about the medical school. After the regents, even by a split vote, had approved this as University policy, he still was talking to legislators from Clark County and from some of the rural counties, against the medical school. And in my opinion, he didn't have to be for it, but he was obligated to be quiet about it after the regents had made a decision. His forum was in the board meeting, not in the legislature.

CAMPUS-RELATED ORGANIZATIONS

The AAUP is an organization really quite close to my heart. I used to be very active in AAUP when I was a teacher, and was an officer of the University of Michigan chapter for a good many years, and holding a variety of offices, and was one of the half dozen founders of the Michigan Council—the state council of AAUP in that state, back in the mid '50's sometime.

AAUP has been until last year or so, a very interesting organization, with a kind of minimum level of activity. It's more like a standby organization on all campuses I know about, has never been very active except in times of crisis when it blossoms forth in a very healthy kind of way, and has been traditionally the kind of main standard bearer for faculty against administrative abuses of one sort or another.

This is changing now because of their decision nationally to become very active in collective bargaining, and it's raised some questions both within AAUP and Without it, about whether they can now continue to be this. You know, can they charge an

administration with abuses against the faculty when they might end up on the other side of the bargaining table. Or, will their very fine studies about salaries, for example, have the credibility that they had in the past, when they are now active bargaining agents. So I don't know how this will be solved.

On this campus, I don't think it's an influential organization, but it's one of the kinds of organizations that attracts influential people into its leadership. I think the Anne Howards and the Gene Groteguts are influential people, faculty members on our campus, and, you know, they're [the] most recent officers, I guess, of AAUP.

The National Society for Professors is the relatively new college-level branch of the NEA, and is primarily, but not exclusively, primarily the arm of NEA set up for potential bargaining purposes on college campuses. It's new on this campus, about a year old, and I understand—you may know better than I— that as of now with maybe seventy-five or eighty-five members, something in that neighborhood.

I don't know much about it, frankly. It has attracted also some very influential members of this faculty including several former chairmen of the Faculty Senate, who in talking with them individually, I think may end up there for different reasons, but are attracted by a vigorous activist kind of organization, more activist than AAUP has been.

Why do you think the AFT failed to organize here the way the NEA group did?

Well, who knows? But I suspect it's the lack of a strong labor tradition in this state, and in the more traditional sense of labor unionism. AFT, for example, when I left Michigan in 1965, had already that year, I believe, succeeded in organizing the public school teachers in Detroit. In 1965, there were zero—there were none—no college faculties organized, so that was, you know, not a ballgame yet. The labor tradition in a state like Michigan is so strong that for a group of teachers or other professionals who wanted to organize, the kind of natural place to look would be to an arm of the labor union. I don't think the organized labor tradition is that strong in this state, whereas teachers' clubs, teachers' associations, teachers' organizations, of one sort or another, have been in existence for many years and I assume as strong in this state as they have been in other states.

The NEA has been the kind of "sleeping giant" among these organizations for a generation or so. The step of moving from NEA as a kind of semi-professional organization to provide good insurance policies sort of thing, to, if you sought for a bargaining agent and they made themselves available, that would be a natural kind of step, in the same way that if you were from a blue-collar family in downtown Detroit you'd seek an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor.

Do you foresee the National Society for Professors becoming a real force in collective bargaining? They talk a pretty strong union line. I just wondered what their approach has been with you?

I've talked with Charles Bartl and Gary Peltier and Hugh Mozingo and the others who organized this group, on many occasions. If you want to know what I think will happen with respect to this, then it's always a fatal kind of thing to make prophecies when the results are possible so near at hand. Maybe this spring. I think there will be legislation introduced in this session of the legislature, successfully, to make it possible for collective bargaining to take place in the higher educational institutions in the state. I think that will pass. In my opinion, I don't think an election for collective bargaining, which would be the next step, on this campus, at least, would be successful that soon. The NSP, as I understand it, very quickly got about fifty members. You know, like overnight, and then accumulated another twenty-five or thirty-, or however many more, in a kind of second effort. I don't detect a great sentiment for collective bargaining on this campus. I think there might be a lot of people who would—some people who would—push for the right to do it, but who are not ready to do it. I think, among other things, salaries which tend to be the central point for most collective bargaining, have maintained themselves reasonably well on this campus. So there were not the poverty kinds of condition. This state is—we've talked about earlier—is a conservative state, and this would be viewed as a kind of non-conservative approach to life. And I think the mechanics of getting a majority vote on this campus are bigger than they appear. We have about six hundred professionals, and about oh, seventy-five or

thereabouts, are off-campus as county agents, assistant county agents, you know, they're in Austin, Nevada and Eureka, and Fallon, and for this purpose, they are full voting members of a possible collective bargaining election. And there are a lot of conservative faculty members on campus in teaching situations. The professional schools historically elsewhere are conservative and they are here, too. The College of Agriculture mostly, not altogether. Engineering, mostly. Excluding Economics, Business Administration, the rest of that college is mostly conservative. You know, it's not an automatic thing that just because there is legislation that there would be a vote for the creation of a bargaining agent. I don't think it's gonna come soon here. The trend across the country is that it will come, but I don't think it's gonna happen this spring.

The Faculty Women's Caucus is even newer, and in its very brief life, has already taken some important positions, and I think it's had some influence already in the development of affirmative action program, although done through the Commission on the Status of Women. I think the more militant kind of approach of the Faculty Women's Caucus—this is all relative, of course, but of the two—has influenced the Commission on the Status of Women. But it's so new, I'm not sure that anyone could appraise its effectiveness, or—. I don't know, I really am having a hard time—. You know, the things they've sent to me about women's athletics and about the affirmative action items have been very good. But I don't—it really is too new for me to form much judgment, you know, on these immediate things. I'm gonna meet with them, I guess, sometime soon, and I can tell you more then.

The Boosters—. (Have I talked about the Boosters in connection with athletics? I

think I have.) I think they are less influential than they think they are. They have quite an impact on our athletic program financially, they raise a lot of money for it. But I hope it's a true Statement that they're far from being in control of it. I meet with them regularly and they're alternately happy and unhappy with me, like Jesse Sattwhite, you know [laughs], depending on how close I come to their wishes on matters. And I don't always agree with. the things they want done.

A case in point was that the leadership of the Wolfpack Boosters, when Jake Lawlor took a sabbatical about three or four, five years ago, I got real pressure to appoint Trachok as acting athletic director, to be followed [as] soon as Lawlor came back, with a directorship. And I refused. As you may recall, Jack Cook, who was a newcomer to the campus, served as acting director. Trachok finally got it, but only after I was satisfied that he was the right person after I'd had recommendations about him from people on campus, that were satisfactory to me, and after I'd spent literally many hours with him about the nature of the athletic program. So I think they may feel self-satisfied, but they shouldn't because their pressure tactics, at least, did not work. So who knows, maybe I was influenced some, but not as immediately or as quickly, or not in the way, I think, that they wanted me to be influenced:

They're good people, and the very strong positive thing that should be said about them is that they are the one constant group of alumni with a constant, steady interest in the University. And it's focused heavily on athletics, but it sometimes spreads out to other things, too. And that kind of devotion to the University is hard to come by, and I'm delighted that it's there. So I cultivate them and hope they stay strong. And they do contribute money to an area that would not

get that kind of support from the funds I have available to me. If it didn't come from there, our program wouldn't be as good as it is now. So I don't want to be negative about them, because I don't feel negative about them, but they are single minded [laughs] and there's no question about that.

I think the Alumni Association I talked about some, too. The big problem there is in developing strength outside of the Reno area, and establishing chapters around the country.

Faculty Wives perform an enormously useful social function —and I don't mean this to be in a deriding kind of way, but I think that is an important thing, and the dances and other kinds of affairs that they sponsor, we wouldn't have if they weren't there. And they do some very good things in only mildly publicized ways for the University. I think you know about their volunteer library project which has, I think, been a very important and useful kind of activity. They give scholarships for the University, and a variety of other things. So I want to make —you know—the group that's easy to poke fun at, I don't think fun should be poked at them. I think they're a serious group that should be taken seriously.

DOCUMENTS OF GOVERNANCE

I think I have referred briefly, or made a couple of references to the Student Bill of Rights, which is another one of the code kinds of things. This one was under discussion for about a year prior to any serious formulation of a bill of rights. There were then and I suppose still are, a couple of kind of model pieces of legislation like this put out by various groups, and these we had considered in the school year '68-'69. The staff of the Office of Student Affairs and the ASUN both had been looking at these and making modifications, in essence drawing out their own in '69-70, the year that Jim Hardesty was president. And I mention that because he was really kind of the author of the final code; he took this on as his major project for his year as ASUN president, and did an enormous [amount] of research, a lot of legal research about court cases that dealt with things about student life on campus, and impressed the attorneys that we had working on this as well as everyone else, with his real thorough grasp of this whole area. He was determined to get this through while he was still president of ASUN and he did.

One of the interesting things during that year on this code was the very effective way that a committee of the Board of Regents worked on this. There is a student affairs committee of the board which, like most of the board committees, is very inactive. Since the board gave up its decision-making by committees, their committees have kind of fallen into disuse.

But the board decided that it would reactivate this committee to work on the Student Bill of Rights, and Harold Jacobsen, as I recall, was chairman of that committee at the time. They met three or four times in the final stages on this, with the ASUN people and administrators who had been working on this Bill of Rights. And I think these were as good work sessions as I've had privilege of sitting in on. A lot of things were accomplished. Everybody was open and frank about hang-ups about various kinds of statements about the rights of students. The debate was good, and the decision-making process really was very good. That's not to say that everything totally went smoothly, but by and large, it

was a very good process. And the result of this was that by the time that this came to the Board of Regents, the final action was really kind of perfunctory, because it had been done so carefully, and with the involvement of the Board of Regents in the last stages of it, through that committee.

It's like a lot of things. It was a matter of major concern and the *Sagebrush* was full of articles about it, and students were greatly concerned and regents were, and everyone was, at the time. And I imagine if you stopped a student on campus—a sophomore, or a junior—and asked him something about the Student Bill of Rights he wouldn't even know what you're talking about. But it's not the kind of thing that's been placed in limbo. We refer to it and use it. And, you know, it has been implemented and we make decisions still today on the basis of what's in that Bill of Rights. And that's good, that's the way it should be.

The two major code activities since I've been here have been the "Rules and Disciplinary Procedures for Members of the University Community," and the second one, the University *Code*. And I would like to talk briefly about these two.

After the Governor's Day incident and the charges that grew out of that against Paul Adamian and Fred Maher, the Maher charges were subsequently dropped, but the Adamian charges were pursued. The University *Code* had some references about procedures to follow through in charges against faculty members. But the old *Code* had, you know, maybe two sentences that in order to apply some due process, we had to really do an exegesis of these two sentences to try to cover the only kind of situation of this sort that we'd had since—I guess since the Stout days, [on] the proposed dismissal of a faculty member,

or charges that might lead to dismissal. For this *ad hoc* purpose, from the *Code*, the University attorneys, the Board of Regents, the administration, developed a procedure. I should go back a minute.

There had been a joint—in the sense of representatives from both campuses—committee of AAUP chapter members and University attorney who had looked at procedures of this sort that might be followed. And they had developed a kind of set of procedures, too. So the combination of those two things, with what we could infer from the *Code*, became the set of procedures that we applied in the Adamian case.

As it turned out in use, it was a cumbersome procedure; I think cumbersome for Paul and cumbersome for the University, too. One of the features about it, that I think was—to everyone except perhaps Paul Adamian (I've never asked him about this, but to everyone else), one of the cumbersome things was the time periods involved. It was a matter of being sure that the charged person would have sufficient time to do the things—prepare defenses or whatever—make responses. There were time periods of up to a maximum of thirty days for about four or five steps in this process. Professor Adamian chose to use the full thirty days on each of these steps. And the result was charges were filed in May and it was, well, late October or early November, as I recall, before everything was done. And nobody had dragged his heels, but Paul had taken advantage of what he was entitled to, of the full time period between each of the steps.

That still irritates a lot of people. I still hear about, "Why did you take so long to do anything about the Adamian case," you know, that kind of complaint. Especially the time factor, but the uncertainty about whether or not we had a set of rules that really covered situations like this led to consideration of a

set of rules of procedures that would protect the individual, but also that would provide a speedy kind-of termination, within that protection, of a case, so it wouldn't drag on for six months.

The other part of this was that I think the Board of Regents were increasingly irritated because the faculties had not taken any actions to talk about responsibilities of the faculty members. After the Elko meeting in May of 1970, one of the questions posed to Gary Peltier, who was senate chairman then, was, "Will the senate undertake some kind of statement about professional ethics, or something like that?" And the response was that the senate would be happy to do this. But then nothing was moving on it, and I think nothing had moved up to that point, so I'm not sure that Gary was really believed. But it's important to report that little Conversation, because within a matter of two or three weeks, you know, long before the senate could have any time to do anything on this, a draft of the code of conduct appeared. So it was really kind of a rhetorical question. I suppose that somebody must have been thinking, even then, about doing from-the-top a kind of code of conduct. I'm not sure. Procter Hug was chairman of the Board of Regents, and I think was interested in this, and I think may have been one of the co-authors of this first draft, and I think Neil Humphrey was. At any rate, by June, a draft of this preliminary code of conduct was widely distributed on campus, and the regents in their June meeting adopted it—you know, a month later—but adopted it with provision that it be considered interim in nature until December, the notion being to allow faculty and students time to propose changes and amendments in it.

This angered a great many people on campus, including me. The anger, I think, was not directed at the substance of the code, but

at the way in which it was done. It was done in a way that's counter to the way that most of us, at least, felt that things like this should be developed. That is to say, to allow a reasonable opportunity for students and faculty in this case, to make a proposal, to which the Board would then react. I was not consulted about it, and I felt I should have been at least informed as president of the University at which it was really directed. You know, I knew about it when I got a copy of it. And this angered me. You know, it was not the right way to go.

The cabinet meeting before the June Board meeting—. The regents by-laws, a policy statement, in describing the chancellor's cabinet, has a provision in it that at the request of any of the presidents, the student body president can be invited to attend the cabinet meeting, and if he is, the student body presidents from the other units would be invited, too. So I think the only time this has been exercised was on that occasion. I did ask that our student body president be present at the cabinet meeting prior to the June Board meeting when this was being talked about. And the other student body president from Las Vegas was present, also.

That meeting was an interesting one, because everyone around the table was on Neil, [laughs] who had been a party to this quick and clandestine (in our opinion) development of a code. He felt quite beleaguered and he was. You know, we then had faculty (because the senate chairmen go routinely to these), two administrators (at that time it was before the community college division), and DRI was really not much concerned about this; but presidents of the two Universities, and the student body presidents all very angry, about this, primarily the way in which this was done. The actual substance of the code has never changed very much, the substance of it, except for one very important matter

which I'll talk about in a minute, but from that preliminary thing, it wasn't changed a great deal. But it was the way in which it was done. And I think if it had not been for this kind of uniform anger about the thing, that it probably would have been adopted as permanent policy at that June meeting. But I think this kind of display of concern on the part of everybody resulted in its considered interim until the December meeting. And this was clear at the board meeting, too. I think all of us spoke about the procedure. And I really think this is what opened the door at least for the amendment thing. At any rate, it was adopted at that June meeting as an interim code.

The faculty senate appointed a subcommittee on these rules, and the ASUN senate had a subcommittee. And by October, the revision from the faculty senate was done and was considered at the October faculty senate meeting. The subcommittee reported back to the faculty senate, and they approved the changes. This went out as a Class A action, and the faculty approved the re-revised code.

Then the coordinating council, which is the faculty group from the two campuses considered this late in October, to consider what UNLV had done and what we had done, but took no action. Then in the meantime, the one matter that did become a matter of great debate, that dealt with substance, was the proposal by Regent [Tom] Bell. He prepared a document of his own, which was very much like the one the senate had prepared, except for one essential matter, and that was that he proposed that hearings on cases, or faculty charged with any violations of this code, the hearings would be done by an attorney, or a group of attorneys. And the attorney then would be the hearing officer, make his recommendations to the president of the University, which had the effect, of course,

of by-passing any peer evaluation, either for students or faculty.

And quite properly, both the students and the faculty were very upset at this. This took out of their hands, their own self-discipline of errant faculty or students, you know, of members of their own community, and turned it over to a non-University person even, not just not them, but somebody from outside the University.

Things had been going along rather smoothly until this proposal came along. And then that met with instant resistance on the part of all faculty and all students. My notes have an interesting comment that the faculty senate had a meeting in December on this campus prior to another meeting of the coordinating council on this matter, authorized the Reno members of that council to negotiate anything they wanted to about this code on behalf of the senate, except, "the principle of faculty control of the procedure is not a negotiable item." They felt that strongly about it.

The proposed December deadline, because of this big debate now raging on this matter, was moved until January, so that the faculty groups could develop a single recommendation and presumably get the support also of the administration. So there was a meeting in December on this. The January Board [of Regents] meeting dealt with this, not as a board, but as a committee of the whole. They didn't take any action, but they considered the Bell document and the faculty document and asked that all this be referred to the deputy attorney general, to get somebody else's recommendation on this, too. The coordinating council met again in February on this, and reached finally some basic agreements among themselves. There'd been some minor disagreements on minor points, so it wasn't all that smooth,

but that one hearing procedure was the basic problem.

The way it was finally resolved was a kind of a compromised position, that in the instances that we've used this, has worked out quite well. The hearing officer, the attorney concept was kept, but his role was very strictly defined. He was to be present both as a consultant to the hearing body, which would be a faculty-student, or student-faculty group, depending on who was being tried. So he would be a consultant with a notion that often an accused person would have his attorney there and so it seemed useful for the hearing body to have the services of an attorney who could talk the same language as an attorney representing an accused person. But he also had another function, and that was he was to make the determination of fact. He was to write a report to the president, and to convey to the hearing body whether or not, after examination of the evidence, the accused was guilty or innocent. He's explicitly excluded from making any comment about sanctions, but he reviews the evidence and determines guilt or innocence. And then the hearing body also reviews all the evidence (at the same time that the hearing officer does), deals with the question of fact, and imposes or recommends the penalties, the sanctions. So it's a kind of a joint thing, but the important thing, that is the sanction part, is kept in the hands of the student-faculty or the faculty-student group.

We've used this now I guess on three or four occasions and it seemed to work well. The attorney does not, in fact has not, dominated the hearing in any way, and he's sometimes been useful to have there. It's really the hearing body that's the important thing. So it has worked out. The final rules were adopted by the board with all of the revisions at its May, 1971 meeting, so it was a full year after the first proposal.

I don't think any other unit at the University has used these to any major extent. We've used the rules a good many times. They seem to be quite functional and I've had no suggestions for major changes from student or faculty. So I think they turned out all right, finally. And, as I say, you know, they're not much different from the ones that were first proposed, but there was a real goof in proposing them the way they were proposed. I think the board would have got what they wanted by doing it the right way and got it as quickly, you know. Still, it was May 1971, before the final rules were adopted.

The basic University *Code* revision has been a very long process. My notes show that my first contact with any notion about revising the *Code* came with a recommendation that came from the Nevada Southern Senate in January of 1968, proposing that the section of the University *Code* that dealt with academic freedom be replaced by the AAUP statement on academic freedom. My response to that, and I have a short quotation from my formal response to it was, I didn't see any reason to make the change, because what was in our *Code* at that time was, with two or three minor word differences, exactly like the AAUP statement anyway, you know. So the differences were extremely minor, like—I've forgotten exactly, but a March 15 instead of a March 1 notification date. It was that kind of minor difference.

The senate, since reorganization of the University in February 1968, that immediately brought about a question of whether or not the basic University *Code* should also be reorganized. The senate on this campus appointed a committee or asked that some work be done on possible revision of the *Code* to reflect the reorganization of the University. So during the summer of 1969, at

the suggestion of the faculty senate, I asked Dr. Eleanor Bushnell to work on a revised *Code* for this campus. And we paid her either full salary or half-salary, paid her for this job during the summer. So she went through the *Code* and suggested some revisions in it that would fit the reorganization and that would be satisfactory in terms of operation for this campus.

The senate had a policy committee on the *Code* that had been looking at this, and they then took Dr. Bushnell's report and worked with it, but didn't succeed really in doing a complete revision. The policy committee on the *Code* was re-formed in 1970-'71, charged to review the current *Code* to determine the changes that are needed in the existing University *Code*, and to rewrite the University *Code* in conformity with the existing organizational structure at the University of Nevada, Reno. There was a special meeting of the senate in May of 1971, and a proposed revision of the *Code* was presented, and as approved. It was proposed that separate codes be adopted for the University System and for the campuses, so it would be in effect for the Universities, three codes; one which would be an umbrella code dealing with some broad common matters, as I recall principles of academic freedom would be in this umbrella code, but procedures, matters of this sort, would be in the University of Nevada, Reno code, and UNLV would have their own code.

This document was submitted to the faculty under the Class A action. The academic council reviewed the document, and the code committee of the senate and a subcommittee of the academic council on code worked on still another revision of this document. So we're now down to the fall of 1971. In the fall of '71, the chancellor proposed that there be a System code to cover organization and

administration of the System and matters of personnel policy, which would be uniform for all divisions, which was essentially the concept that this faculty had talked about a year before. And he appointed a subcommittee of representatives of DRI, UNLV, and the University of Nevada, Reno, to work with him on revision of the code. This was in the fall of 1971.

This subcommittee developed a draft (now we have about the third or fourth draft of a code) and presented it to the advisory cabinet meeting in November of 1971. Changes were made in this draft at that cabinet meeting, and this revision then was distributed to all the faculty of both campuses. In the late 1971 or early 1972—we had about four or five version of a code up to this point.

Now they achieve a colorful status, and this document was called the "buff document" in order to award as much confusion as possible with the floating three or four earlier versions. This was printed on buff-colored paper. This was discussed at the senate meeting on this campus in February of 1972 and a lot of changes were proposed by the senate to this buff document. And these changes were presented to the coordinating council that same February, and the coordinating council developed then—and there were changes proposed from UNLV too. These changes were all agreed—or, they reached agreement on a revised version of the code, which became known as the "green document."

So the faculty then on this campus, the green document being the coordinating council's version, the buff document the version developed by the senate here, the faculty was asked to vote on which of the two they preferred. The green document won out. The green document had a provision in it that, in my opinion, was a very bad provision, but it was the thing that made it popular with the

faculty. I then, and still do, disagree with the faculty wholeheartedly on this matter.

It had a provision that really had been authored by Ed Barmettler, who was senate chairman that year, which proposed a System senate, which was all right. This would be in effect, a kind of replacement for the coordinating council. I didn't have any objection to that. But it gave the System senate power to override an action by any senate, as I recall, by a simple majority vote kind of thing. One reason it was popular on this campus was that the proportion of representation into that super senate for the next eight or ten years would be very heavy from this campus. Our faculty size is more than twice as large as UNLV, and DRI's faculty size is very small. So we would really be a clear majority for eight or nine years.

But that's a very short-sighted view of things. We didn't know what, at that time, what would be happening in the Community College [Division] and how rapidly that might grow. They would be represented in this senate. Eight or nine or ten years down the line, UNLV very well might be as big as, or bigger than, we are. But even more quickly, the Community College thing bothered me. It might even be possible for one Community College even, let's say the Clark County Community College, to be the decisive thing in controlling the lives of faculty on the two University campuses. To give them that much authority is a thing that I disagreed with the faculty on this. Finally, that provision has kind of faded away in the revisions of the code as they've come down the line. But that was an important feature in that green document.

The Board [of Regents] considered the various colors of the code in a May 1972 meeting, and adopted on an interim basis, a tentative kind of adoption, something very much like the green version of the document,

but without the great authority that the super senate would have in it. That was changed some. Anyway, in May the board took an action and proposed final action at the July meeting. There were additional amendments at the June board meeting, and final action in July of 1972. The new *Code* was adopted.

There's some rather significant kinds of changes over the old *Code* that appear in this one. One thing that's different is that more authority rests with the campuses even than was true with the reorganization. For example, the presidents of the campuses are empowered to make final decisions on promotions to Rank II (or to the assistant professor rank) without reference to the Board of Regents at all; to make final salary determinations for faculty, except for faculty who are at Rank IV, step 11-plus (you know, the outside, or above the schedule, where the Board would review all those salaries). But all within the schedule, the president makes the final decision. There're some technical things, too, that are related to this, like approval of fund transfers, which all had to be cleared through the Chancellor's office; they're now all done in the president's office. They're now all done in the president's office, transfers of funds between units on the campus.

So the general thrust of it is in the direction of greater delegation from the Board of Regents to the campuses, of a variety of things. And I think this is healthy.

One other feature of this code that is unlike the other one, that drew a lot of attention, was, there is a more detailed spelling out of causes for dismissal of tenured faculty member[s]. The old code followed the AAUP statement which is rather broad and—I can't recall the wording of it, but it's you know, "a tenure faculty member can be dismissed for cause," and then starts spelling out the procedures. What this document, the new code has, is

an elaboration of what “for cause” means, and there are six or seven “for cause” kind of things, like demonstrated incompetency in his field, insubordination in terms of assignment for which he’s qualified, moral turpitude—which got a lot of discussion.

And there was, I think, a rather genuine mixed feeling on the part of faculty about whether or not things should be elaborated this way. Most of the people who are actively working on the code did not want this kind of detailed elaboration. But I think there was a mixed feeling about whether or not this should be in this way. That’s the way it ended up. I think there are six or seven possible reasons for dismissal.

A couple of these are so standard and so widely accepted—for example, insubordination. The way it’s worded in the new code I think is very bad, but the principle of insubordination about certain kinds of things has always been accepted, AAUP, everyone else, as a grounds for dismissal. If, for example, you’re qualified to teach freshman English, you’re a member of the English faculty, and they need you to teach freshman English, and you refuse to do it; you know, just absolutely refuse, that kind of insubordination, repeated insubordination, could be grounds for dismissal, tenure or not. But I think that this one simply says, “insubordination,” and that one I argued against because that’s so loose that if a dean asked a faculty member, “Would you please close the window?” and he says, “No,” you’re got a case of insubordination, you know. And it’s absurd, but it’s the kind of thing that you don’t want to leave any possibility for absurd judgments, based on it.

At any rate, the next step, and even though it’s been about a four-year procedure to get a new code, it’s not over yet. The next step is for each campus to develop its own

set of bylaws. And this is underway on both campuses.

The last code the faculty saw until it was finally adopted in July was the vote in March between the green and the buff documents. And there were changes made, subsequent to that, and prior to the final action to the board, but the changes were made almost exclusively, not by regents or administration, but by the code committee, which was a faculty committee. Bob Gorrell was chairman of it. So it was, you know, was an understandable complaint but it’s an instance where a faculty group was doing the work. I think Bob Gorrell was essentially pleased with it. You know, no one is happy with something that has been worked out this way for this long with everything in it. But I think he, as chairman of the code committee, felt that the notions of the faculty senate, at least on this campus, came out pretty well in this document.

He did a beautiful job, incidentally, of representing the faculty. I rarely have seen a more diplomatic way of telling a group, like the Board of Regents, that, “You’re wrong,” or, “Go to hell,” [laughs] or—. They listened very carefully to everything he said, and he disagreed on a whole list of items with them, but he did it in a beautiful way; very firmly, you know, he didn’t back away, but he’s masterful with language, of course, respectful in dealing with them, but firm, and he won a lot of points, he won a lot of arguments on the faculty side by the way in which he did it, in my opinion. So much so that later, when I recommended him to Board of Regents as dean of the college, they were enthusiastic about it, and talked about the good job he had done as chairman of the code committee. And they knew why, you know [laughs]. They’re aware of what battles they lost to him, skirmishes, at least, they lost to him. He did a great job of representing the faculty, even

though the faculty may think it's a different document than the one they saw. I don't know, this one has been so long, and I don't remember many side-lights about this thing. I'm sure at the time there were a lot of things going on about it, but—. I guess I'm just kinds bored with it. It's been going on so long.

Every department on campus, and every college, every unit, is supposed to have a set of bylaws under which it operates. Many of these, I don't even see. As I recall, the college bylaws are sent to the senate for information. Maybe I get copies of those for formal ratification. Departmental bylaws, you know, only as a matter of courtesy do I see them. And they've been very slow in coming. This was for some departments, a painful thing to do. Some departments had been run as dictatorships for so long that there was real resistance to developing bylaws. And I know that in some departments, because I've talked to the faculty, that there were heated debates about what went into these bylaws. What kind of representation or what kind of authority the faculty had as compared to a department chairman, for example. So there's some real issues. I'm unfortunately just not in a position to have any systematic knowledge about this, except incidental things that I hear. Some of them have not been done, or have been slow, not because of deliberate resistance, but because the people are satisfied with the way things are going, and there hasn't been any great feeling of need for this, you know. Some departments are managed that way.

Occasionally, there are problems that come up on the campus that get back to these bylaws. The most recent case in point is a very unpleasant and unhappy nepotism situation that gets to the status of a set of bylaws, really. The bylaws of the School of Home Economics did not have a statement in them—they had

a set of bylaws, but no statement covering nepotism. And Marilyn Horn, as the wife of the dean of the College of Agriculture, any recommendations about her status in terms of promotion or salary level and so on, by regents' bylaws, should be handled through application of the regents' nepotism policy, which incidentally was a policy developed by the faculty senate and approved three or four years ago, by the regents. So last spring, when I presented the recommendations on her to the Board of Regents, they rejected them, not out of hand, but sent the recommendations to be made in accordance with the bylaw or the policy on nepotism. So they quickly put together a nepotism procedure, or a procedure for implementing a nepotism policy. And did it badly, in my opinion, and it's created a real problem with Dr. Horn, and a real problem of morale in that school that I hope will be resolved before we go through the cycle in the spring of evaluating her services to the University. So occasionally I—because of bylaws—have things that come to my attention, this being a case in point.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

I would like to talk about some things that are of particular interest to me that maybe have not been referred to earlier.

The first year I was here, we started, in the spring, an honors convocation as a way of recognizing students who had achieved primarily an academic achievement during the year. I discovered when I came, this was done at commencement time by citing graduating seniors who had accomplished well, who got into Phi Kappa Phi or made the honor roll, or whatever else. And that was fine, but it first of all was limited only to Seniors who were graduating, and second, it wasn't a very wide audience, you know, just the parents and friends of the graduating class. And it seemed to me useful to recognize students in course, and an honors convocation would give an opportunity to do it for freshmen as well as graduating seniors. So this was no big thing, and a lot of places do it, but it seemed to me a good thing to add, and it's been very successful in terms of attendance. Every year the attendance has grown, with no fluctuation—not even like the stock market—it just continues to grow.

About two years ago, we merged into this and changed the nature of it a little bit, by merging into it the traditional Governor's Day activity. This was done with the concurrence and help of the ROTC staff, who saw no reason that the governor had to review the troops when he was here. They do have, and I think quite properly so, in late spring, their own review, and I think that's great. Any department should do this if they wish, where they give their awards for various kind of things. They didn't feel that the governor had to be present to do this, but they did want to keep some things that traditionally the governor had been associated with as far as ROTC was concerned, like the recipient of the Governor's medal from the ROTC brigade. And it also seemed to me, particularly after the problems of real embarrassment of the University and the governor at the Governor's Day ceremony—and embarrassment is as strong a word as I think we should use, but it was embarrassing.

And also sometimes, you know, the only time the governor gets on campus is for the

Governor's Day. And it seemed to a lot of us that it would be desirable for him to see other things than ROTC. So we now call this "Governor's Day Honors Convocation." And I think it's worked; this merger has worked very well. Instead of having it late afternoon, as we had before, we have it just before noon in the spring, at a date convenient to the governor. We honor now not only those who have achieved academically, but those who achieved in University kind of ways. Like the Governor's medal in ROTC, which isn't necessarily bound up in grade point average; the outstanding athlete, which is not necessarily bound up with grade point average; the Thorntons and the Cavanaughs have annually given a peace prize, which is not tied to academic performance.

So we're now honoring academic and activity really kinds of things, which is better still, it seems to me. It's the one occasion to give the community a good impression of the kinds of things that we think are important around here, and that *truly* we think are important. And so I like it, and I think it's grown well. I think the evolution, the changes in it, have been very good, really. It's no big thing, but [laughs] it's still part of the University, I think.

Also the first spring I was here, we began an Arts Festival which has become an annual affair. This varies in format from year to year, and sometimes has been as long as a week, sometimes only a couple of days. The nature of the things that happen in it vary considerably from professional performances by visiting troupes of one sort or another, or orchestras or dancers or players, to very amateurish do-your-own-thing kind of things, but it's again, an occasion to provide events for people interested in the arts, and to reinforce the real interests that a large segment of this

University community has in the arts of various kinds. That's something that I think is not well known either, and I'm delighted that our people have a chance to participate or to be spectators at these artistic things, kind of concentrated in a period of time. It's had varying success. It depends so much on how hard the committee works that year, and what the nature of the program is. There have been some very good things in it. And I think it's been a stimulus to other kinds of art activities for the whole year. Students' interest in this has varied some, too. I think by and large, the students have participated well and helped support it financially and I think they like it. The turn-out at various things is generally pretty good.

We also, this year for the first time, are finally getting underway something that's been close to me, that I've been quite interested in. That is some kind of an award for outstanding teaching. And this one's met with a lot of resistance from faculty. I think the resistance—I'm not quite sure I know why. I've taught on campuses that have awards like this, and I know that some faculty on those campuses have really and truly been kinda jealous about it because they don't win 'em, [laughs] you know. And I've heard comments at Michigan, for example, "Sure. All it takes is a glib tongue and you get to be the outstanding teacher," you know. They're running it down. So maybe the selection isn't perfect every year, but I think the notion of, again, telling the world and telling the faculty and the students that we have a high regard for effective teaching, is worth while. And I'm sure we'll make some bad selections. By we, I mean the students and the faculty and the alumni who are the ones who make the selection. But we'll make some good ones, too. And we'll reward some good people

who deserve it. So I hope at the honors convocation this spring we'll have our first outstanding teacher award. That's the way the time schedule's set up anyway.

Another group that I think I haven't referred to in here at all, and it's a very important group on campus, is the Staff Employees Council. It seemed to me that we should have a group of the members of the University community who work at the University, who are by our use of terminology, not the professional staff. And I don't mean that in a judgement kind of way, but it's a definition problem. These are people who are technically part of the State Employment Service, the clerks and the technicians and the whole variety of very important jobs on this campus. They had no way to make their voices heard on this campus. They could get messages back to Carson City where many decisions are made about them, but their working conditions, for example, are all on this campus.

There was a Campus Clerical Council; still is. But it's a small group, and it's exclusively secretaries. The B and G people, the librarians and, you know, all the other people were not involved in this. So with the help of Bob Jeffers, the director of personnel, we set up during that first year a Staff Employees Council, which meets every month. The first couple of years it was an appointed group. Since then it's been [an] elected group. We have the campus divided into areas. Auxiliary enterprises, for example, has two representatives, one from food service and one from housing; Stead has a representative; the library has a representative; and there're two or three at-large members. So it's a fairly representative group, and it's a very good group, very active.

Through this group, we've made some recommendations to Carson City about a

variety of things, and some of them have been bought because of the influence of this group. We've made a good many changes on campus that you and I normally, and not being in that group, wouldn't even be aware that they're problems, and they seem very minor, but they can become very major. Like, "Do you have to tell your employer that you're being interviewed for another job?"—another job on campus. It's a major kind of thing, and this group deals with policy matters. It's not an individual grievance kind of group, it's more like the faculty senate is, for the faculty. And I think it's been very good.

This group started a recognition day for employees of the University. We now give, as most organizations do, we give service medals for length of service, and retirement plaques, and—you know, the gold watch type of things, but that's important too. We have a luncheon once a year and a distinguished speaker to talk and to help do this ceremony. So it's been a very, a very good group.

Well, just a few more things. One experiment we tried here that if we *ever* get back on our feet financially I'd like to reinstate, and that was an ombudsman we had for a trial period of about six months. This was, must have been about the spring of 1968 is my recollection—or '69 maybe. At any rate, it was prior to the flow of major confrontations and that sort of thing on campus. We didn't have any during that time, but I don't think that's because we had an ombudsman. I think it was just not—the timing was a little different. We did find enough money to employ Chariton Laird, a retired professor of English and extremely well respect[ed] former faculty member, one who had been here for many years and knew the University inside and out, as an ombudsman on a half-time basis for six months. He kept a very

careful log of all the things he did and the people he saw and the kinds of problems that were brought to him. And it's reading that log and his recommendations after, that is very convincing evidence that he, you know, it's filled a real need. He solved a lot of problems in his office, many times just by being able to tell a student or a faculty member to whom he should turn for help. That often is a real problem, you know, "What do I do about this?"

One or two matters that were of kind of major University concern he dealt with that came to the president's office. So I had an opportunity both to see him in operation [and] dealing with a relatively major problem. We had a problem with a lecturer in the philosophy department that was basically a misunderstanding about the nature of his appointment here. He'd been given certain kinds of information by the chairman of the department, other kinds of information by the dean, and his contract read still a third way, and he was extremely suspicious that all of this was a massive conspiracy to get him in some fashion. The principal fact about him was he was a temporary replacement for a man on sabbatical. So we weren't out to get him, but the problem was, maybe in the total life of the University not a massive thing, but it certainly in the life of an individual is an enormously important thing. And I'm sure that the satisfactory resolution of this was made infinitely easier by having Chariton Laird work with the problem before it came and after it came here.

So that's something that I think was very successful, that if we ever had a few dollars extra, that I'd want to do—set up this kind of office on a permanent basis.

One kind of thing that maybe I've talked about, that I feel good about, and that's been

copied by a good many other universities, was the development of the University search warrant. Well, the problem of the rights of the University and the rights of the student about his room in a residence hall is really a serious problem. There are a whole host of court cases, and some of them are still going on, that indicate that the University has the right, if it chooses to use it, to enter a room in a residence hall for any reasonable purpose dealing with health, safety, whatever, of the other residents of the residence hall. And the contract that our students sign for residence hall occupancy has always had a provision in it giving this right to the University, to enter their rooms. But it also is a kind of an infringement on the individual's right to privacy and right to "his home being his castle" kind of thing, even though it's a room in a six hundred-room dormitory. And we've had over the years some—in my opinion—some very unwise things happen on the part of residence hall directors, or University police, who just enter a room on the vaguest kind of suspicion, usually associated in the earlier days with drinking, and more recently with the possession of marijuana more frequently.

So about three or four years ago, the ASUN and the Office of Student Affairs jointly, developed a University search Warrant, which grows out of our right to do this but inhibits our use of this right. And it's like any other search warrant, you know, we have to have reasonable cause to believe that there's an infraction of University regulations. It has to be signed by the dean of students, can't just be signed by anybody. And she signs it only when this reasonable evidence is presented to her. I think she's used it only maybe half a dozen times totally, in three or four years. It hasn't stopped the opening of doors completely, but it sure has slowed it down, and I think it's worked very well. As I say, it's been copied by

a good many other colleges and universities. And I think it's a pretty good compromise between the kind of community health and safety feature that we do need to have: we can open a door if we think a bomb is in the room without a search warrant, you know, but we ought not to extend that to opening the door because somebody said some smoke is coming out the window, or that they heard a girl's voice in a man's room kind of thing. You know, we need more evidence than that to—.

One thing that I've enjoyed doing that hasn't happened much—didn't happen at all last year and hasn't happened so far this year, but I think that every other year it has, on a University-wide basis—. Most years I've had kind of open forum sessions with students primarily, usually in the lounge of the Travis Union. Kind of like a press conference thing with no speeches, but a chance to answer questions and hear complaints and just "rap." I've done it—last year several times—with smaller groups, like I think three or four times last year I went over to Nye Hall and did this there. But I haven't done it campus-wide, if you like, in a couple of years. It's something that I talked to Rick Elmore about just before Christmas, picking up again under ASUN sponsorship this spring sometimes.

I enjoy it and I think it means something to the students who show up. You know, there're never any big crowds, except for the couple of times that I talked about earlier. But it's worthwhile, I think, to have, even if there're only twenty students; if they've got something on their minds, I think, great, they should have a chance to talk about it.

I've tried this with faculty and finally gave this one up, and I may try again. For about a year before every regents' meeting, I would call a forum and I announced that this was wide open, but so we'd have something

to begin talking about, I'd go over the items that were coming up for action by the Board of Regents. The first one of these, there must have been seventy-five or eighty people or a hundred people present, because there were some things coming up before the board (and I've forgotten which ones now). They might have been related to the *Code* or something else, that had attracted a lot of faculty interest. The second one, there were about twenty-five faculty, and it finally got to the point where there were four or five of the same people coming back every month, so I stopped. That didn't seem productive.

And I think one reason for this is that the faculty, through the senate chairman, is very well represented about regents kind of things. He attends a[n] advisory cabinet meeting, lie goes to all the regents' meetings. The senate chairmen here have been very good about reporting back to the senate at least, and the senate, I think, probably represents the group most active and most interested in the broad affairs of the University. So there're opportunities for the faculty to get inputs of that kind through their own. So maybe that's the reason the faculty things really haven't developed.

But it really got kind of—it just wasn't worth doing. We'd schedule a big auditorium and six people would show up.

The faculty Christmas reception is also not a big thing at all, but it's something that Nena and I are very selfish about. We enjoy it. It's a great opportunity to see a lot of faculty, and we see people that we never see except on that occasion. The faculty is getting increasingly large, and it's nice to have occasions like this. I gather, from the visiting that goes on, that the faculty who come at least enjoy seeing other faculty. But it's basically a selfish kind of thing [laughs] that we enjoy it, too.

In this connection, about every other week, I have a unit on campus come to the office for coffee, for about an hour. And that's selfish too, because it's a chance to see a lot of people. This is not just faculty, these are everybody who works who can get away for the hour.

It's a chance to see and meet a lot of people I haven't met. And the other thing is that this office has some things in it that I think faculty and people who work at this University should see. Notably [Robert C.] Caples' pictures, and as I think I mentioned earlier, as one of the blacks in a confrontation with me said, "It's not your office; it belongs to all of us." And it does. And I think it's, you know, why shouldn't they come here and see the office, because not many do otherwise. Both these though have kind of selfish motivation [laughs] behind them.

I think I'm about through. I think I've about run out.

I've thought about whether I should have a closing oration of some sort. I'm not sure that I should, because hopefully, this is in a kind of midstream, you know. If I come back in March, maybe I can give you the closing statement [laughs].

I think implicit through this are some things that are major concerns of mine, like the kind of learning environment that we can set up and keep on a campus. My hopes for an open campus where people can feel free to live their own kinds of lives with respect to others too, and talk about things that ought to be of concern to them. And where there can be a lot of involvement of all of us, in shaping the nature of the University, that it ought not to be a reflection of me or my predecessor or my successor, that it should be a reflection of the whole University community. But these things, and other things like that, I hope are kind of implicit in the kinds of things I've selected out to talk about. So I don't have any final speech.

MY LAST YEAR AT NEVADA

Well, this is so impromptu. In the planning [for the legislative session] there was a considerable amount of preplanning that had to be done, because as you know we began our budget planning a full year ahead of time, like in the January of even-numbered years, planning for spring of odd numbered years, [and the] legislative session. And the preplanning was occasioned by the unexpected drop in enrollment on this campus. And since so much of the request you make at the legislature is based on either head count or FTE student enrollment, there had to be a kind of crash revision of our request for this campus. The same type of thing was true at Las Vegas, but not to the same extent. Their enrollment didn't drop, but it was less than the projected amount. So there had to be revisions for both campuses. This affects primarily the request made for funds for instruction and department research, which is based on a formula that has to do with enrollment. The funds for other units, like the service units, agriculture research and extension, were not influenced really by this. So, that didn't take much change.

I'm sorry, I haven't even looked at dates, but along about November, I guess, in a regent's meeting, a revised budget request was taken to the Board of Regents and approved by them and this was promptly shipped to Carson City, analyzed by the governor's office, and then we had a meeting with Governor O'Callaghan and some members of his staff, prior to the opening of the session. Two years before, after the session was well under way, the various groups of people went down to see the governor—Faculty Wives group, some members of the faculty, both individually and in groups. And some students as well, during the session, Went down to talk to the governor about our budget request, two years ago. His kind of response (so I've been told, I wasn't present for these meetings) was, "Fine, I appreciate your lobbying like this, but it's too late, you should come see me ahead of time, before I make my presentation to the legislature and before the session starts."

So, this year, this past year, first, Neil Humphrey asked the governor how he wanted to approach this. Did he want these pressure

groups talking to him, and if so, when? How would he like it handled, since he'd expressed an interest by saying for example, that "the teachers in the state really put the pressure on me, you didn't," kind of thing. He asked that there be a single presentation; traditionally, the administrators and regents do this kind of thing, before each session. He asked that that group be augmented by representatives from these groups.

So, in our session with the governor, about a two-hour session, the chairman of the Faculty Senate, the president of ASUN, the president of the Faculty Wives, a couple of other faculty members, I think. Gene Grotegut probably was there both because he was a good Democrat, but also because he was at that time, I think, chairman of AAUP or active in AAUP on campus. (I'm sorry, maybe he wasn't there. I don't want to get history wrong, but there were a couple of other faculty people with us.) A member of the Alumni Association [came]. So, there was totally a group of oh, about twenty people representing all the divisions of the University, but including, in addition to the administrators, these representatives of the groups that talked to the governor the year before.

He was much more receptive than he had been two years before, about our budget request; and, indeed, after that session, added a couple of things. The process is that we see what his recommendation will be, we have a chance to respond to it, at this meeting. So, we'd seen his draft recommendation, and we responded to it. As a result of this response he added enough funds for a four-year law enforcement program to both campuses, an additional hundred thousand dollars, approximately, for building and grounds, special projects for both campuses. These were added on for changes in his first draft

of his proposal. There may have been one or two other small things of this sort.

The big thing at that meeting—and subsequently, the meeting with the legislature—that I kept pushing hard on was the need for a different student-faculty ratio for allocation purposes, for programs, teaching programs in the health sciences (that's the Medical School and Nursing), developed, I thought, a pretty good set of arguments on this based on what other schools were doing, on student-faculty ratio and costs of education in these two areas and in other schools, and so on. I think the governor misunderstood. I don't think he ever understood what we were talking about when we talked about a student-faculty ratio of 3.5 to 1 in medical education, because the kinds of responses he would make would be, "Well, can't a faculty member teach a course or two with three students in medicine and then teach some more courses in biology?" So I don't think he understood the concept of this reduced student-faculty ratio. We ran into the same kind of problem, we tried presenting it about fifteen different ways to the legislative money committees and still, I think, didn't get complete understanding on it. If we'd been successful with that, that would have freed altogether about \$200,000 additional money for other programs in the University. And that's why it seemed to me [this] was the most salable kind of thing, rather than upsetting the formulas that we'd used and it would still produce some extra money for the University at a time of declining enrollment. If it worked. This is, of course, related to the problems with the faculty about the fact that it didn't work and since it didn't work, it cost money, instead of producing some extra income.

I think that's about all about the meeting with the governor, on this. Oh, one other

thing he did, one other small addition he made was additional money for the library on this campus in order to keep it open more hours. And again, it wasn't a big thing in terms of the state's budget, but it was an important matter to us. This came about because of some comments that Rick Elmore, ASUN president made, about what he considered to be a high priority at the University.

Generally, I think all of us felt reasonably good about his attitudes and about the fact that we got more things than he originally said he would give us (which is unusual in dealing with governors) even if they weren't big things. The big disappointment was, maybe he understood, but I interpret it as being a misunderstanding about the student-faculty ratio bit, for the health sciences.

The big problem in working with the legislature on budget was precisely the one that I just mentioned about trying to explain to the governor. There was a point in time when it looked as if we were going to get this. The assembly ways and means committee had voted in favor of, not really of the formula, but of giving an extra—as I recall—\$200,000 to the Medical School, which would have been about the same thing as if they had worked with the formula that we were talking about. And then the senate, for reasons that I don't know, because it happened very late in the session, the senate finance committee refused to go along with this. So we ended up with no additional Medical School funds. But there was a period of a couple weeks when I felt real happy [laughs], getting all these little extra things plus, I thought, reasonable expectations for \$200,000, or if not that, some compromise position from that with the senate finance committee.

But it all disappeared, the 200,000. And I'm sorry, I don't know why it did. I suspect

that it had something to do with the proposed law school.

For the first time since I've been here, we had a joint hearing before the joint money committees as our basic presentation of the budget. And this, I think, was an efficient way to do it. That major presentation to either of the committees has to be done, but it really doesn't get to the heart of the matter most of the time; it's an explanation of the budgeting process and of what the formulas mean and what the dollars mean and answering questions, usually kind of *pro forma* questions at that stage, about what various programs are. It's a kind of a definitional meeting.

That meeting with the two committees was an all morning meeting, as I recall, and went quite well. I don't recall any traumas about that. But my major push was to agree with the governor's recommendation, which is past history, not just since I've been here, but forever. It shows that that's basically what's going to happen anyway, and to agree with that, but disagree on the allocation for the health sciences programs—those two degree programs—and again, try to explain why it was important to have a different student-faculty ratio and what a student-faculty ratio means, in that kind of teaching situation. I was listened to fine, but who can tell, especially at that early stage, whether it has any impact? This hearing was very early in the session, as I recall, much earlier than it usually is, like the second or third week of the session. I was back again a couple of times before each of the committees.

(I'm sorry I haven't checked back by notes on this.) In a hearing before the assembly ways and means committee, just a day or two before that, an ad came out in the *Sagebrush* advertising an "erotic device" sold in Las Vegas, which created some consternation—every session, I'm sure, if I read back in what

I said earlier, there has to be something like this in every session. And this was at this time, although it was not a big thing. Buddy Frank, the editor of the *Sagebrush*, had written an apology, and distributed it to each member of the legislature. I apologized to that group and through them to the legislature. At a hearing, Buddy Frank was suspended, not by me, but by the publications board, for, as I recall, a week, from the editorship, then reinstated. I thought everything about that was appropriate. This time, once the apologies from him and from me had been given, that seemed to take care of it. I didn't hear any more about it during the session, except for a little kidding now and then. It wasn't the same kind of thing as some of the earlier things had been. I continued to hear and still do hear from Regent Steninger about it, but as far as the legislature is concerned, that seemed to take care of it. Which is about as heartening a thing as happened during the session. There seemed to be much more coolness about this kind of thing.

You might just try to evaluate some of the various legislators' attitudes on University problems, generally.

This is really into what you just asked me to do. There developed during the session a considerable amount of interest in the number of Las Vegas students who applied to and who were admitted to the Medical School. And this expression of interest began as a complaint that we were discriminating against Las Vegas. We gathered together all the facts and the facts simply did not bear that out. The number of students who applied from Las Vegas, for example, was a relatively small number. The proportion of those that were admitted was like twice as high as the proportion of those who applied from Washoe

County, [and] who were admitted. So the facts didn't bear this out, but there still was a great deal of uneasiness on the part of some Las Vegas legislators that something wasn't quite right about the admission process of the [Medical School]. The ones who showed greatest interest was Mahlon Brown in the senate, Keith Ashworth, the Speaker of the assembly, and the optometrist from Las Vegas—his name slips me right now.

At any rate, these three primarily, although some of the other senators from Las Vegas and some of the other assemblymen showed some interest in this. Lt. Governor Reid also showed some interest in this problem. So Neil Humphrey and I had a luncheon meeting with these people during the session to find out what really was the nature of their problem. We ended up still with some uncertainty about it, except there still were not enough Las Vegas students, presumably, here in school.

They had heard some roundabout comments that we were critical up here of the kind of science training given at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and as a result of that therefore, were not admitting graduates from UNLV. This was totally not the case. I don't think anyone had been critical except in a way that, I think, we finally cleared up. When we pinned down particular cases—there was a particular case of a student who had graduated in the x-ray technology program, at Las Vegas and who wished to have courses he took in that program count as the equivalent of courses taken in a bachelor of science in biology program. The kinds of science courses that he took were all very useful but all directed toward a vocational goal. Like, positioning the body for x-ray is not quite the same thing as a good course in anatomy. So this particular student was told that he should take some of the more traditional courses in

this field, and that's what led to some of these stories.

Any rate, we met with these legislators and then met again a week or so later with the same group, but with Dean Smith and the chairman of biology department at UNLV, who came along to say that, you know, "Our relationship is fine with them," he's "had no problems," which was true.

We kind of hammered out a new kind of first-step screening process for students in the state and there is now a committee, a screening committee, more than half of whom are from Las Vegas. That's a proportional representation; one man, one vote. This group includes some MD's, some members of the faculty at UNLV, some lay citizens, and it's statewide in character. Their function is to do the first screening on all in-state applicants for the Medical School, wherever they're from. As I say, a majority of 'em are from Las Vegas, and the final decision (as it must be in order to keep our accreditation) about who is admitted comes from the faculty of the School of Medicine here. But it's really no problem to us, we're delighted to have qualified students from Las Vegas as well as Reno.

This seemed to satisfy them. These meetings were not angry meetings at all, they were very pleasant meetings and I think everybody was trying to get at (including the legislators) the solution to a misinformation problem that they said was widespread. (And I know what widespread means; you know, it means three people say something about it.)

To come back to your question that got me off on this, one interesting result of this was that, I think we ended up for this campus with pretty good rapport with the legislators that were involved in these meetings. I think they were satisfied and pleased that we were interested in working out a problem rather than just being defensive about it. And I

think Mahlon Brown, who never had been personally unfriendly, but I think, you know, he became politically a little bit more friendly. The two members of the assembly, Keith Ashworth, and the optometrist whose name [laughs] I'll remember sooner or later, also, I think, reacted favorably to this.

You asked about comments about individual legislators. As often happens some of our own legislators were bigger problems to various things that the University was proposing than some from down south. Bill Raggio was a member of the senate finance committee and was really of no help. He had replaced Len Harris on the committee and, I think, was as effective as Len Harris had been, in terms of concern and effectiveness in pushing our program. Coe Swobe was pretty actively negative. This goes back not to anything related to this, but goes back to the problem about Harold Kirkpatrick. Coe was a close friend of Kirk's and was his attorney, and felt that Neil Humphrey in particular, me too somewhat, but Neil in particular was unusually cruel and out to get Kirk. And, I think [Coe Swobe] has had a thing about that since the Kirkpatrick incident. I think it reflected itself and in the legislature. Coe was on my back considerably about not doing enough for veterans, Vietnam veterans, at the University. Ironically, since that session was over, after study of the figures for this past academic year, this University ranked either ninth or tenth in the nation in the proportion of veterans from the Vietnam War attending the University. So we were doing all right to start with. But, as I'm sure you know, we gave a kind of special emphasis to the Vietnam veterans and to the "mature women" on our special admissions program that was approved, either toward the end of the session or right after the session was over.

Don Mello was chairman of the assembly ways and means committee and was a very

good friend of the University. He was very effective and as I say, almost got us a couple hundred thousand dollars more. But not quite.

I think what I've said here and about previous sessions probably would be just running the record over again on some of the others this time.

The other matter that was of some consequence before the legislature was a little bit about collective bargaining. And I really was not very heavily involved in that. I went down one time for one committee hearing and there must have been—I don't know, eight or ten committee hearings on this subject. Really, you know, it's something that Neil Humphrey was carrying himself, and when you do your oral history with Neil you can get him to talk about that, 'cause I wasn't that deeply involved, but it was another big matter of concern for both the University administration and certainly some faculty, at least. The NSP was there actively through Jim Richardson. He testified, I think, at every session that Neil testified. But I really had such a minimal involvement in that.

In many respects this was a much less painful session to me than any of the recent ones, because the only diversionary kind of thing' was that ad in the *Sagebrush* which cooled down so quickly. [This was] unlike other sessions, or at least a couple of the other sessions, when every meeting with everybody the thing that would come up would be Paul Adamian or Governors Day, you know. So in that sense, it was easier to talk with them about the issue at hand without us being thrown off by something that was, at least in my opinion, irrelevant to what we were trying to do.

Well, during the session Judge Foley gave his decision on the Adamian case. Did that create any problems?

No, not really. But mentioning Judge Foley reminds me that the other big thing of course, that—I don't know why I forgot this—that occupied an enormous amount of time was this law school business. Dave Zenoff, justice of the supreme court, who was one of the founders of this juvenile justice program on our campus and who's a close personal friend had been pushing for a law school as long as I've been in this state. And I've known Dave since I first came. His daughter and my daughter had worked together in Washington, one summer before I came here. And so, we've known him a long time. He's been pushing for a law school; originally, pushing for it in connection with the National College of the State Judiciary and the juvenile justice program. But, I guess, recognizing the political situation now and finding a couple of legislators, Senator Foley and Assemblyman Jack Schofield in the assembly, both became very active and made this a real political issue in this session, and held hearings in Carson City, and hearings on both campuses and hearings of the alumni and you name it, they were there. Dave Zenoff spoke at all the sessions.

The University people who testified at both, and both my testimony and that from Las Vegas as well was a tremendous show of lack of interest. We have enough problems, both campuses felt, right now, without adding another professional school at either place. Despite that lack of interest on the part of anybody in the University, really, at one time, a bill was either introduced or contemplated that would force this on the University starting right now, in Las Vegas. Thank goodness that didn't materialize. It finally developed into an appointment of a study committee, which is in operation now, to look at feasibility financially and in terms of program, and so on. But that was not really an issue between the University

and the legislature; it just became strictly a political thing and not an educational thing. And my impression is that Las Vegas even now would be quite happy to see this thing die, and I know we would here.

In these times on both campuses of either declining enrollments or steady enrollments, this kind of additive growth that we've been living with is no longer there. It's difficult. If you add something new, something has to go, and I don't think either of us want to face up to that.

Maybe that's enough about the law school bit. But it was another major thing involving the University.

Okay, you want to talk about faculty.

... So much uproar, so much pulling and hauling after it was all over. When you come home, and you think, well, we brought it off as well as we could, and then, everybody who's had a chance to be in on work programs and everybody who's had a chance to go to meetings, and everybody who's had a chance to be at hearings, is all of a sudden upset because they're not informed.

Yeah, and that is where I would start, because I think, as I think I may have indicated in some earlier talks, that one thing I've tried to do the last two or three rounds on work program and budget is to involve the senate and ASUN. They were represented all through. The ultimate decision obviously has to be mine, about what's recommended to the board, but the opportunities for input, which were real and were taken in many cases, and certainly for information about the situation was there at all the meetings that were attended. You know, it wasn't because we had private meetings or because it was when no faculty representative was present. As I indicated earlier, Dr. Crowley was present at

the governor's meetings and at every one of the legislative committee hearings on budget. The thing that took me a little by surprise was the fact that in some ways, it was treated as if it were all brand new, and it wasn't brand new. It was real and I think the reality came home suddenly when the legislature adjourned, and that's all we had. But it was not a new problem by any means.

The senate's concern was (and I'm sure you have this on tapes from the year-end interviews you did)* an understandable one. In my opinion, in order to secure accreditation for this [medical] school, which had so much involvement in it primarily from outside funds, but nonetheless a lot of involvement and a lot of commitments to a lot of people, we needed to put more than that \$40,000 of state funds into it annually that we had been putting into it. The best information I could get was that it would take \$240,000, roughly annually, of state funds, both to provide the money that was needed, but perhaps just as importantly to give assurance to other funding agencies that this state is willing to support another medical school program. So we did add what amounted to (and I can check these facts), as I recall, it was about \$180,000 in budgeted money to the Medical School and the difference between that and the 240 that I mentioned, was made up by increasing surcharges on fees for medical students, other income generated only by the Medical School. So that, you know, if it weren't here it wouldn't be in the budget anyplace. But it did mean draining off some money potentially from other programs to put into the Medical School.

*Annual Oral History of The University...1972-73.

And this quite understandably had an upsetting effect on a good many people in the University community: I think certainly the whole senate—not just its leadership—the two professional groups AAUP and NSP, several administrators, and a good many faculty, I think, generally even without the pull of the leadership of the faculty. You know, it's always difficult to tell how many are concerned about anything, but there was a large number, I think, and a genuine concern. I share the concern. I still do.

I met with the senate leadership on two or three occasions and when they told me they were going to approach the Board of Regents, my objective was to help them make their case as strong as possible, even though it was against my recommendation. I thought, you know, if the regents had anything to decide, it should be decided on the basis of the best possible case. I wasn't trying to build their case, but point out on some two or three instances, some obvious misstatements that would've looked foolish to the regents, and that kind of thing. So this was made a major presentation at two Board of Regents meetings, lasting totally, I guess, seven hours or so, in the two meetings.

I don't know how much detail you want about this.

I felt I had good communication with what they were trying to do and I was not trying to hide anything, nor were they. And we weren't trying to sneak up on the flank or on the blind side of either. So I knew what they were going to say and they knew what I was going to say. And my position was that I had to make a decision in making recommendations to the board, that I thought overall would serve the best interests of the University. And I thought this approximately \$180,000 would not be a disaster to the rest of the University; it would be difficult, but not a disaster. And

it was absolutely essential to the continuation of the Medical School. At this point in time, to coin a phrase, I felt that we had no choice about the Medical School but to go on with it.

You still feel that way?

Yes, I do. I would not have changed my decision, even now. The fact is we did get full accreditation later, and one of the very strong factors in the exit interview before the team that was here, was the degree of state support. They would have liked to have seen more, but I think they were satisfied that the state was willing, through University funds, to support it.

You know, it's not a pleasant thing for me nor I'm sure for them, certainly not for the Board of Regents to have this kind of thing brought to them at great length and with great strength of feeling. But, as I have told a lot of people including them, I think it would be an even more traumatic thing, I wouldn't want to be associated with the University, if the faculty didn't feel it could do that. Even though I thought they were wrong—they thought I was wrong, and even thought it really was in many ways too late, you know, the allocations had been made by the legislature and once that happens, there's not a great deal of freedom of choice. You can't shift funds from Las Vegas or the Community College here, kind of thing. So it was kind of foredoomed. But it was still, I thought, both traumatic, not very pleasant, but very important that it be said, if that's the way faculty felt about it.

I kind of had the impression that the Regents rather enjoy being talked to by the faculty, with this kind of presentation.

Yeah, I guess they do.

They have so few contacts with the faculty, actually.

Yeah. And it was a kind of laying bare of the souls in many ways. It was complicated a little bit by a problem we had in the School of Nursing, which deserves a separate little thing, that I will take up, but not right now. But that complicated it some too, because much of the information that was used by the faculty about the nursing situation was totally wrong. And their source for it was using very old information and—didn't account for changes in federal funding and so on that were already taking place. At any rate, the final result was three votes against the adoption of the work program for this campus—no, three votes against the adoption of the work program, totally. And it's important to make that distinction because of the three votes against it. I'll now give you my version of the three votes and the reasons therefore.

One was by Mel Steninger who found a great opportunity to vote against something I was proposing. That's my opinion about the reason for his negative vote.

The unlikely partners he had in that voting situation were Flora Dungan, who was concerned about many of the things the faculty had presented, but was equally concerned about the enormous and ambiguous cost for intercollegiate athletics at UNLV, and that's why it's important that it be kept in mind that it was not just this campus, but the whole System. At least, she told me immediately after the vote and subsequently, that that was perhaps more important to her than the problem on this campus.

The other vote was by Nedra Joyce, and all I know in her case was that she hastened to tell me that it was not a personal vote against me [laughs]. I don't know what more—I haven't

talked to her any further about it. But Flora's vote, I think, was influenced as much by the athletic situation (which was a mess and still is, in my opinion) in Las Vegas as it was by the Medical School situation here. She said that and I believe her.

If you or someone were expecting a kind of thirty-minute defense of my position, I won't give it, because I've given it in another context. I'm not angry that people disagreed with me at all. I wasn't at the time nor am I now. The best of all lives is that we agree on everything as we go into this final vote situation, that is better for all of us. But if there is a real disagreement, I think it's fair to air it. So I'm not resigning the presidency of the University of Nevada, because the faculty and I disagree on something, I'll assure you.

No, it's just that some things take up so much attention from the faculty, from the news media, from private correspondence around the campus and all this sort of thing that no matter when this is open, thirty, fifty years from now someone's going to want to know what was going on as far as you were concerned.

Well, it was an attack on the decision I had made about budgeting. And no question about that. I still think I did the right thing, and they think I didn't. I'm sure they still feel that way. There's some curious kinds of things in that document the faculty senate assembled with impacts on various people and programs.* Some of it (I have not told the faculty senate this, nor will I, since this will be closed for a while)—but some of it—I'll say it now—some of it is quite legitimate. Some of it though, to me, is funny. And the reason it's funny is that I see in it some things that people

*Copy in University Archives

have been saying to me for eight years. And now, they found a great soap box to stand on.

For example, Alan Gardner in the psychology department came to see me, six or seven years ago, and spent a full hour telling me that all overhead recovered from his research project should go to his research project. That's what he says in this senate document also, and how badly he's going to be hurt because less overhead will be available to him. Which is part of the thing that was at issue. But you know, it's the same thing that—Alan just found a better audience now than just me for saying this. Some of the dire prophecies about losing accreditation, a couple of them, had been told that accreditation had just that spring been [reaffirmed]. We'd been revisited and reaffirmed with full knowledge of our financial situation for the coming year. And this has happened. So, you know, some of the things in that document are quite real, others are phonies. But I'm not about to say that to them.

I think that in the long haul, the better case they can make for more funds, for the University, fine. I think one good benefit of this has been beginning this fall there will be a team effort, both in the ways we report what we do, which has an influence on how much money we get, and on better communications, even, than we've had in the past about the decision-making. But with the setup we have, the final decision still is going to have to be the person's decision and the Board of Regents, with all the inputs that he or she can get on this.

It was painful, you know; I don't mean to make it sound as if it all rolled off my back. You know, I didn't enjoy having the faculty attacking this position. It was painful, but not so painful that it broke my heart or anything.

Well, I can't imagine its being considered a personal attack, anyway.

No, no I never considered it a personal attack. I believed in what I did and I suppose all of us have kind of a fatherly approach to an action we've taken, if we still believe the action's all right.

CONCLUSION

For a long time, for a good many years, I've felt that there is a kind of maximum amount of time that a president and an institution should be together. I may have mentioned in the earlier transcripts that it was my intention to stay on as president through the Centennial, then go into teaching full time, because I think you reach a point where the marriage doesn't work anymore, or gets so stale that all the romance has gone out of it for both parties. I really feel that very strongly.

So, when I was asked to submit my name for one of the two presidencies in the Maine system, this presented the other alternative to going back into teaching. That is, to move to another institution. So I did send them credentials of one sort or another, and went back to be interviewed.

The reason for Maine, or the reason for the attractiveness of Maine, there probably were three or four reasons. One was that Nena and I both have felt that the only two parts of the country we are at all interested in living in is either the West or New England. So if I were to get another job it, you know,

probably wouldn't be in the Midwest or in the South, but either in the West or New England. That was one reason. Another reason, the chancellor of the system there is a long time friend of mine, [Donald Raymond] Don McNeil, a person with whom I have worked when I was at the University of Michigan and he was at the University of Wisconsin. And we were doing similar kinds of things. And I've known him and, well, as a matter of fact, had him out here as a consultant one time on General University Extension. So he was another reason why this was an attractive assignment. A third reason was a kind of personal one which backfired. That was that our daughter and her husband and our two grandchildren lived in Boston, which is only ninety miles from Portland. And as it turned out, after I had agreed to go to Maine, they moved to the Bay area. So now we're still 3000 miles apart, or will be very shortly. And those telephone bills will keep mounting up, I'm sure [laughs]! But that wasn't the only reason obviously; that's not a good enough reason for this kind of a move anyway.

I went back and spent a week in Maine, about half of it in Portland and Gorham and the other half in Orono at Bangor, being interviewed for the two presidencies. The Orono campus is much like this one; it's the oldest campus in the system, it's the land-grant campus and the largest campus. The Portland-Gorham University center is administratively a new operation. It's only three years ago that the two campuses have been merged administratively. Quite a different pair.

The Portland campus historically was a kind of municipal college with a downtown campus of about twenty acres, as close to downtown as this campus is to downtown Reno, housing mostly programs that are urban related. The programs in social work and law enforcement, business administration, for example, are housed there. The Gorham campus is historically a state teachers college, residential campus, about a hundred and fifty acres. Beautiful wooded rolling hills, ten miles from Portland at a little cross-roads village, a residential campus, a lot of dormitories. And house on that campus are the liberal arts programs, by and large, and education programs.

This I found to be an intriguing kind of problem, of two campuses that are widely different in their history and in function. The problems of creating a single institution out of these two disparate kinds of institutions is a problem that presents a lot of interesting challenges.

I must confess, too, to being strongly influenced by the kind of pressure that was put on in a way to go there. Don McNeil talked to me when I was in Maine three or four times. And before I left—I was in Orono, as my last stop in Maine—he insisted I spend Saturday morning on my way back in Portland with him. And we started at breakfast, at 7 o'clock and until noon with a lot of arm-twisting. And

he was on the phone almost every day. Nena would ask me when I came home, "What did Don say today?" [Laughs] Apparently what had happened was that the selection committee at Portland, after that first visit, gave him a slate of one name. I had letters from most of the members of the committee urging me to come there, and so it was a good lesson in persistence, I guess. I went back and spent another three days there, and then went back again with my wife. She and Don had dinner together, I sat there, and as he sold her on it—it didn't take much selling—so I did say yes.

As far as I can tell myself and I—you know, who understands all his inner motivations about anything? But one, that I did not feel any pressure about leaving here at all, despite a recent flap with the faculty. And I did not consider that. I talked to several faculty members, told 'em I was considering the move and wanted to know what they thought about how serious an administrative-faculty problem there was, their comments whether it was not—. One reason I asked this question was because I wouldn't want to leave with a real serious problem left hanging. The problem was serious, but not that divisive, and I think as time has passed—a few months has passed—I think it's alleviated itself some, partly because more money has come in than we thought would come in. And that's helped.

So my leaving is not motivated by any negative factors at all. And I really, really mean that, that I go back to my original statement, that it's because I think I'm within that dangerous age when it would be so easy to sit at my desk and shuffle papers and be delighted with the status quo and try to avoid problems that a university should face. I've seen this happen to other people and I don't want it to happen to me personally and I don't want it to happen to this University. And, I don't think

it's here yet (I'd be the last to know), but that's part of it too; I probably wouldn't even be aware of it when it happened and I don't want to slip into that kind of middle-age senility that I think could happen and has happened at other places. So I'm leaving because I found something that's intriguing and challenging, and I'm leaving with a general feeling of satisfaction about the University of Nevada, and about my stay here. And I much prefer leaving under those conditions than leaving unhappy or angry or being ridden out of town on a rail. Any of those things could happen at some point.

Both of us are looking forward to the move to Maine, with real eagerness. At the same time, it's very difficult to leave the part of the country that we love, and a home that we love, and friends that we love, and that's tough. It is very tough, but I still think I've done the right thing, even though every box I pack makes it [laughs] harder and harder to leave.

You asked about any unfinished items. Or course, the financial problems that this University has that currently are problems brought about by static or decreasing enrollments, more than anything else, is an unfinished kind of problem. But it's also the kind of thing that there's not much I could do, or anybody else can do about getting more students here, or more tuition money. There are a lot of things that could be done with the recognition that resources are limited. That will be the nice challenge for the new president here, that I hope he or she recognizes that resources will be more limited as time passes here, and that different sets of priorities have to be developed and different decisions have to be made about growth, where it takes place, and about the continuation of programs as well as the development of new programs. We're not in

an additive kind of growth situation anymore here, nor in higher education, generally. And I think that fact has to be faced. So, you know, that's a problem that is here; it's not one that's going to be solved overnight, it's not something I can do anything about before I leave. So that problem will be here, but it's going to be true, sooner or later, at all universities.

Some of the other things that were hanging fire, I've now done something with. Like the athletic policy. I don't think this record needs to spell out what it is. But I have made a decision about function of the two athletic boards and relationships with the president's office and with the Directors of Athletics. That was kind of a burning issue that I told Jim Anderson that I would take that off his back, and not leave that as his first problem. And so it's probably the last major thing that I'll do here.

There are of course, continuing problems, but I don't think you need a catalog of all of those.

It was really just the unfinished business. Kind of problems that anybody might want to look back on and say, "Well, I'm glad that I don't have to handle that one," or "That's not my business and I don't have to do that."

I really don't think there were any of any consequence, except that athletic board business. I didn't go to the Cabinet meeting yesterday for example, and for the next board meeting, because I won't be at the next board meeting. So, I'm in a happy stage of not even knowing what they talked about yesterday [laughs].

That automobile trip across country is going to be an interesting experience, because I will have finished everything I can do here, will not yet have any responsibilities in Maine

and the major kinds of decisions I'll have to make will be where I stop for coffee and where I have lunch. This will be the first time that I can ever remember that kind of interlude. And it won't last more than five days [laughs].

When I first came here, I came out by train and came out and got to work right away. Maybe a twenty-four hour or thirty-six hour lapse and that's all. This will be five or six days.

Five or six days to be out of work.

Yeah, [laughs] out of work, that's right. If I weren't driving I'd be pacing the floor all the time [laughs].

Are there other things that you think I should [discuss]?

I can't think of anything. I thought that you would like to, you know, just maybe say something in summary or what you expected would happen here, or whatever. Instructions to your successor, whoever "she" may be.

I talk about he or she.

I'm not about to pass on any instructions to a successor. I think that's bad taste. Let he or she be his own or her own person. I think one advantage to a change, for the University point of view, is somebody can come in with a fresh look at what the problems are. Maybe they'd be a lot easier to solve with a fresh look.

These eight years have been a truly tremendous experience in every way. I've learned a great deal that I hope I can remember in my new job. And I've got great feelings of satisfaction about a lot of things that have happened on this campus. Some frustrations about some things that I have been either been so slow or didn't happen. Just as a case in point, when I first came it seemed to me that this was an ideal kind of campus

situation for a development of genuinely good interdisciplinary kinds of programs. And we've made a lot of attempts at this, with only moderate success here and there. That is a frustration.

The campus was, I thought, such a good place because it was big enough to have expertise in a lot of different areas, and yet small enough to see the walls of kingdoms crumble enough for people to work together. Some good things that happened, the COPI program, was I think a good step in that direction. But not as much as I hoped would take place. I think I mentioned this in my first speech to the faculty and this being something I'd hoped would develop, and it has some. But not as much as I'd hoped.

I can't imagine a place in the world with finer people than this campus and this community. We have so many friends here and we really hate to leave. That is the distressing part about moving, that we'd like to take all of you with us [laughs]. And I've had a really very fine support from the students and faculty and other administrators and from the staff, and the alumni and the community. And despite criticisms here and there, I've never felt anything but really good about the kind of support, not just for me but for the University. And, I think when the support often has come for me, it really has been a manifestation of a feeling about the University and that's the way it should be.

This is just kind of wandering [laughs].

And I've had, of course, one experience here that uh so few people have had and that's so totally unforgettable that I cherish very much. I don't need to say what that is do I?

Well, that N. Edd Miller Day really was an outstanding affair.

That was, yeah.

Our two children, both of whom really never lived in Reno very much, are both angry about our leaving. This is their home and [laughs] this is where they think we should be. We'll be back.

I think I've not mentioned these three people, and it's through no lack of appreciation, but maybe because I'm so close to them. Those are the three remarkably fine people who work in my office. And they are just great. They're three such different people that they operate in their different ways, but they're a great team. And they've been tremendous to me and whatever effectiveness is in this office I think, they deserve about ninety-five percent of the credit. Jean Baldwin, and Agnes Heidtman and Lorna Loshbaugh are great people.

And I didn't want to finish all of this without that very proper and necessary credit to them.

That's enough.

ORIGINAL INDEX: FOR REFERENCE ONLY

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, they have been reformatted, a process that was completed in early 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

A

Academic Council, 15-17
81-84, 224, 401
Academic Council, chairman,
16
Academic freedom, 173,
400, 401
Academic vice president,
44, 82, 83
Adamian, Paul, 145, 305,
392, 393, 434, 435
Adams, William, 8
Administrative reorganization.
See University System
Administrative vice president,
44, 45
Admission policy, 62, 81,
83, 244, 433
Affirmative action, 261, 263,
264, 338, 387
Agricultural Extension. *See*
Cooperative Extension Service
Agriculture, College, 25, 29,
34, 86, 104, 191, 194, 196,
198, 204, 223, 252, 276,
277, 380, 387, 409
Agriculture, dean, 29, 33, 194
Alcoholic beverage policy,
295, 299, 301
Alumni, 57, 117, 323, 346,
347, 389, 413, 435, 453
Alumni Association, 20, 66,
227, 346, 347, 389, 425
American Association of
University Professors (AAUP),
122, 383, 384, 392, 400,
405, 406, 425, 438
American Federation of Teachers
(AFT), 384
American Indian Organization,
339
American Legion, 269, 278
American Medical Association,
197, 200
Anatomy, department, 199

A

Anderson, Fred, 11, 152,
165, 170, 178, 197, 199
200, 205, 209, 378
Anderson Health Sciences
building, 110
Anderson, James T., 8, 44,
51, 72, 80, 83, 169,
190, 369, 450
Anthropology, department, 71
Archeological Survey, 38
Armstrong, Charles, 3, 4, 6,
7, 11, 14, 16, 20-23, 26,
81, 128, 153, 268, 355,
356, 378
Art, department, 47, 49,
71, 131
Arts and Science, College,
43-46, 49, 50, 86, 188,
195, 196, 218
Arts and Science, dean, 8,
43-56, 168, 169, 230
Arts Festival, 412, 413
Ashworth, Keith, 430, 432
Asian-Americans, 253, 255
Asian American Alliance, 339
Association of Higher
Education, 10
ASUN, 87-90, 122, 123, 128,
131, 143, 242, 268, 272,
274, 292, 325, 330-332,
339, 390, 391, 396, 418,
419, 437
ASUN president, 7, 18, 125,
241, 274, 286-294, 325,
345, 390, 395, 424, 427
ASUN senate, 128-130, 268
Athletic board, 450
Athletic fee, student, 237,
240, 241, 323-325
Athletics, 4, 161, 162, 166,
167, 229, 231-234, 238-245,
249, 323-326, 388, 389, 450.
See also Basketball;
Football; Intercollegiate
athletics; Tennis; Track;
Women's athletics

A

Athletics, director, 236,
247, 324, 351, 388, 450
Athletic department. *See*
Physical Education and
Athletics, department
Austin, Nevada, 65, 386

B

Baepler, Donald H., 273
Baldwin, Jean, 7, 67,
128, 269, 454
Band, marching, 322
Bankofier, Roy, 369
Barmettler, Edmund, 403
Barnes, Roberta, 10, 45, 315
Barrett, Tex, 79, 80, 128,
335, 336
Bartl, Charles, 385
Basketball, 69, 162, 232,
236-239, 241, 243, 246-249,
323, 325-329
Basta, Samuel M., 65, 66,
132, 288, 342-347
Beesley, Maurice, 2, 4, 5
Bell, Joe, 288, 289, 293
Bell, Tom, 272, 397, 398
Bergin, Jay, 356
Big Sky Conference, 236
Bilbao, Juan, 214
Bilbray, James, 155, 156, 167
Biochemistry, department, 199,
216
Biology, department, 49, 70,
216, 217
Black Student Union, 77, 128,
131, 140, 245, 291, 328,
329, 331, 333, 334, 337, 339
Black students, 47, 75-81, 130,
135, 138, 143, 167, 169, 244,
253, 257-259, 290, 310,
326-329, 335-339. *See also*
Minorities; Negroes
Black Week, 128, 130, 337
Blankenship, Warren, 308
Board of Regents. *See*
Regents, Board of
Bohmont, Dale W., 33
Boosters. *See* Wolfpack
Boosters

B

Boosters Club, Las Vegas, 167
Boyd, Alex, 339
Britt, Mai, 11
Brown, Mahlon, 202, 206,
430, 432
Brown, Russell, 250
Budget. *See* University budget
Buildings and Grounds, 116,
117, 414, 425
Buildings, naming, 111-114
"Buff document", 402, 406.
See also University Code
Bureau of Business Research, 10
Bushnell, Eleanor, 4, 10,
265, 400, 401
Business Administration,
College, 260, 387
Bylaws, campus, 406-409

C

Calendar, University, 83,
85, 293
Campus planning, 99-110
Campus Clerical Council, 414
Cannon, Howard W., 148, 149
Capital improvement fees, 105
Caples, Robert C., 421
Carpenter, Kenneth J., 93,
96-98, 246
Carson City, Nevada, 202
Center for Religion and
Life, 288
Certification, teacher, 371
Chaffin, Bill, 287
Chancellor, 10, 15, 16, 21,
27, 29, 34-36, 39, 40,
52, 140, 141, 156, 159,
174, 176, 212, 276, 363,
365, 402, 405
Chemistry, department, 216
Chemistry, building, 113
Chicanos, 253, 255
Church Fine Arts building,
112, 114
Church, James Edward, 19, 112
Citizens advisory committees,
64, 72

C

Clark Administration building,
112
Clark County, Nevada, 152,
155, 205
Clark County Community
College, 404
Clark, Walter E., 112
Clark, Walter Van Tilburg,
18, 19
Code Committee, Faculty
senate, 401, 407
Coffin and Keys, 285
Collective bargaining, 383,
385, 386, 387, 434
Commission on the Status of
Women, 387
Commencement, 26, 119, 410
Committee to Stop the War
in Vietnam, 122, 277,
285, 286
Commonwealth Fund, 215, 217,
218, 219
Community colleges, 105, 156,
260, 273, 361, 362, 396,
403, 404, 440. *See also*
Clark County Community
College
Community Relations, Office,
64, 65, 342
Computing Center, 34, 36-41, 105
Cook, Jack, 388
Cooperative Extension Service,
361
Coordinating Council, 397,
398, 402, 403
COPI, 452
Cotton, George, 339
County agents, 386
Crawford, Jerry L., 2, 3, 5
Crowley, Joseph N., 173, 274,
437

D

Dankworth, Richard T., 141
Davis, Robert H., 141, 253, 257
Davis, Emerson S. "Stan",
331-333, 335, 336, 339
Davis, Grant, 11
Davis, Sammy, Jr., 11

D

Dean of Students, 45, 82,
342-346, 418
Del Papa, Frankie Sue, 125,
241, 289, 290, 293, 323, 348
Desert Research Institute,
21, 25, 28-32, 34, 36-41,
105, 198, 199, 276, 356,
381, 396, 402, 403
Development, Office, 355-358
Dickerson, Denver, 149
Dining commons, 43, 71, 132
Dismissal. *See* Faculty
dismissal
Dodge, Carl, 203, 378
Douglass, William A., 214
Driggs, Don, 45
Dungan, Flora, 441

E

Economic Opportunity
Program, 77
Economics, department, 387
Education building, College
106, 110, 113
Education, College, 86,
371, 372
Education, Nevada State
Board, 371, 374
Education, Nevada State
Department, 371, 372
Education, State Super-
intendent, 372
Educational Opportunity
grants, 254
Edwards, Harry, 128-130,
133, 134
Electrical Engineering
building, 102, 103
Elko, Nevada, 54, 125, 126,
164, 226, 260, 394
Elmore, Marjorie, 218
Elmore, Richard "Rick", 69,
274, 291, 294, 318, 325,
427
Employment Service, Nevada,
414
Engineering, College, 25,
44, 189-192, 196, 260,
369, 387

E

Engineering, dean, 44, 190
 English, department, 18,
 143, 146, 147, 168
 Enrollment, 15, 24, 423, 449
 Environmental Studies Board,
 188
 Erskine, Graham, 110
 Ethnic studies, 250, 338
 Eureka, Nevada, 65, 386
 Executive Committee,
 Faculty senate, 88
 Executive vice-president,
 7, 8, 10
 Experiment Station, 29, 360

F

Faculty, 3, 5, 9, 14, 15, 17,
 18, 22, 25, 27, 30, 32, 33,
 42, 46, 48, 50, 52-54, 57,
 60, 69, 75, 82-89, 93, 95,
 116, 120, 122, 123, 127, 144,
 147, 150, 158, 159, 161-163,
 165, 168, 180, 182, 186, 187,
 190, 191, 195, 199, 212, 216,
 217, 220, 221, 223, 224, 240,
 243, 246, 247, 264-269, 272,
 277, 279, 286, 287, 302, 303,
 313, 325, 326, 329, 332, 353,
 354, 362, 363, 382-387, 392,
 394-399, 402-409, 413, 416,
 419-421, 424-426, 434, 437,
 438, 440-444, 448, 452, 453
 Faculty Administrative
 Committee, 27-33
 Faculty Christmas reception,
 420
 Faculty dismissal, 405, 406
 Faculty insubordination, 406
 Faculty senate, 14, 84-89, 95,
 122, 162, 222, 224, 231, 243,
 245, 246, 384, 394, 396, 397,
 400-403, 407-409, 415, 420,
 437-442
 Faculty senate, chairman, 85-89,
 125, 274, 384, 396, 420, 424

F

Faculty Wives, 389, 424
 Faculty Women's Caucus,
 261, 387
 Fallon, Nevada, 386
 Far West Conference, 234-237
 Fike, Ed, 124
 Finance Committee, Nevada
 state Senate, 106, 146,
 367, 368, 381, 427, 428, 433
 Finehout, Ray, 355-357
 Fire Department, Reno City,
 370
 Fleischmann Foundation,
 104, 111
 Fletcher, Dean C., 199, 216
 Foley, John P. (senator), 435
 Foley, Roger D. (judge), 435
 Football, 4, 66, 69, 135,
 136, 162, 232-243, 246,
 249, 323, 326-328
 Foster, Luther, 250
 Frank, Buddy, 429
 Fransway, John, 203
 Fraternities, 312-316, 343
 Free speech, 159, 284
 Free university, 319
 Friends of the Library,
 94, 97

G

Gardner, Alan, 443
 General University Extension,
 30, 50, 68, 446
 Germain, Ray, 157
 Goldwater, Bert, 148
 Gorrell, Robert, 18, 19,
 45, 50, 407
 Governor, Nevada state, 8,
 56, 105, 157, 173, 206,
 207, 360, 362, 366, 410,
 411, 424-428, 437
 Governor's Day (1965), 7,
 8, 9
 Governor's Day (1970); 47,
 54, 124-128, 133, 145-149,
 158, 159, 286, 289,
 303-306, 345, 348, 392,
 410, 411, 434

G

Governor's Day Honors
 Convocation, 410-413
 Grading policy, 83, 85,
 86, 256
 Graduate School, 50, 68
 Graduate School, dean,
 50, 68
 Graduate Student Association,
 122, 123
 Graduate teaching fellows,
 144, 145, 168, 169
 Grant, Archie c., 152,
 157, 167, 176
 "Green document", 402-406.
See also University Code
 Grotegut, Eugene, 384,
 424, 425
 Gundlach, Robert L., 9

H

Hall, Wesley, 197, 200,
 201, 207
 Hardesty, James, 241, 288,
 289, 293
 Harrah, Bill, 11
 Harris, Len, 433
 Hartman Hall, 112
 Harvey, Robert D., 169
 Hatcher, Harlan, 7
 Hathorne, James, 12, 384
 Havas, Paul, 346
 Hazard, Ben, 47
 Health Sciences building.
See Anderson Health
Sciences building
 Health Service, student, 71
 Heidtman, Agnes, 454
 Heron, Dave, 4, 92-94,
 96-98
 Hettich, David, 18
 Heyns, Roger, 6, 133,
 134, 250
 Higginbotham, Alfred, 114,
 154
 Highway Department, Nevada,
 204
 Hill, Robert, 279, 357
 History, department, 46

H

Home Economics, School,
 104, 191, 194, 196, 409
 Homecoming, 66, 284, 315,
 337, 338
 Honor roll, 410
 Honors Board, 188
 Honors convocation. *See*
 Governor's Day Honors
 Convocation
 Horn, Marilyn, 409
 Housing officer, 8
 Howard, Anne, 384
 Hug, Procter, Jr., 170, 178,
 215, 378, 394
 Hughes, Howard, 208-211,
 213, 214, 219, 365
 Humphrey, Neil, 16, 21, 23,
 27, 34-36, 42, 72, 137,
 138, 141, 148, 153, 159,
 167, 168, 171-173, 176,
 180, 256, 257, 271, 277,
 368, 378, 379, 394, 395,
 424, 430, 433, 434
 Hydrology Board, 188

I

Indians, 250, 252, 253,
 255, 257, 258, 260
 Information, director, 76
 Information, News Service, 66
 Ingersoll, Mike, 7, 286, 287
 Institute of European
 Studies, 188
 Inter Tribal Council, 252
 Intercollegiate athletics,
 161, 162, 229-249,
 322-325, 441
 Intercollegiate Athletic
 Board, 242, 248
 Irwin, Ralph, 3, 8, 43-45

J

Jacobsen, Harold, 55, 152,
 165, 169, 172, 178, 180,
 300, 301, 391
 Jeffers, Robert, 414

J

Jessup, Donald K., 365, 366
Johnson, Ed, 259
Jot Travis Union, 7, 8, 11,
47, 78, 101, 102, 128,
129, 131, 138, 269, 294,
329, 331, 332, 419
Journalism, department, 114
Joyce, Nedra, 441
Juvenile justice program, 435

K

KCRL, radio, 349
Kean, Tom 206
Kellogg Foundation, 219
Kinney, Dan, 310, 335-337
Kinnison, C. B., 369
Kirkpatrick, Harold L., 45,
48-56, 59, 168, 218, 433
Klaich, Daniel, 173, 290,
325, 329-331, 336
Knudtsen, Molly, 152, 165,
172, 178, 180. *See also*
Magee, Molly
KOLO, radio, 349
KOH, radio, 349

L

Labor unions, 384, 385
Laboratory for Environmental
Patho-physiology, 198
Laine, Michael, 132
Laird, Charlton, 18, 19,
416, 417
Lamb, Floyd, 202, 206, 215,
368, 378, 381
Las Vegas, Nevada, 2-5, 9,
23, 24, 31, 151, 156, 164,
172, 173, 200, 204-206,
209, 210, 226, 271,
429-432, 436
Law enforcement program, 425
Law school (proposed), 428,
435, 436
Lawlor, Glenn J. "Jake", 7,
236, 388
Laxalt, Paul, 124, 173,
206-209, 364, 365

L

Laxalt, Robert, 8
Lecture building, 103
Legislature, Nevada state,
91, 99, 104, 106,
145-148, 155, 156, 158,
200, 201-206, 216, 218,
362-369, 373, 376,
378-382, 386, 423-437, 440
Leonard, Paul, 349
Lerude, Warren, 348, 349
Lesperance, Anthony L.,
248, 249
Libraries, branch, 94, 95.
See also Life Sciences
Library; Mines Library;
Nevada Technical Institute
Libraries
Library (UNR), 90-97, 100,
102, 112, 115, 223, 265,
318, 366, 367, 414, 426
Library, director, 82, 93,
94, 96-99
Licata, Richard, 199, 216
Life Sciences Library, 223
Linskie, Rosella, 307
Lobbying, 363, 367, 368,
376, 378-380
Lombardi, Louis, 11, 136,
152, 154, 166, 170, 171
Loshbaugh, Lorna, 454

M

Mack, Effie Mona, 113
Mack, Ernest W., 200
Mack Social Science building,
103, 110, 113, 114
Mackay Day, 118
Mackay family, 104, 111
Mackay School of Mines, 25,
102, 104, 189-193, 196
Mackay School of Mines,
dean, 190
Mackay Stadium, 110
Magee, Molly, 269. *See also*
Knudtsen, Molly
Maguire, Craig, 40, 41
Maher, Fred, 148, 149, 151,
168, 169, 183, 392

M

Maheu, Robert, 211
 Malone, Bob, 332, 333
 Manville, H. Edward, 72, 214, 356
 Marijuana, 418
 Marschall, John, 244
 Maupin, Ernie, 287, 288, 293, 345
 Maupin, Michele, 9
 Maupin, Michon, 9
 Maxey, Belle, 285
 Maxey, George Burke, 10
 Mayberry, Bob, 290
 Medical School. *See*
 Medical Sciences, School
 Medical Sciences, School
 49, 62, 94, 100, 110, 155, 166, 167, 188, 189, 197-205, 208, 209, 212, 214, 216-227, 365, 378-382, 425, 427, 430-432, 437-439, 441
 Mello, Don, 433
 Miller, Kenneth, 19, 172, 306
 Miller, Nena, 12, 73, 129, 135, 136, 178, 251, 306, 307, 309, 376, 420, 445, 447, 448, 449
 Miller, N. Edd Day. *See*
 N. Edd Miller Day
 Miller, Thomas W., 269, 279
 Military Affairs Board, 270, 272
 Mines Library, 95
 Mining. *See* Mackay School of Mines
 Minorities, 250, 252, 253, 254, 257, 261, 262, 264, 314, 326, 327. *See also* Asian-Americans; Chicanos; Indians; Negroes
 Mobley, Elaine, 342, 344
 Mordy, Wendell A., 21, 24, 25, 30-32, 38, 40, 356, 380, 381
 Morehouse, Harold, 93, 94, 96-98
 Morrill Hall, 115, 117, 118
 Morris, William A. "Wildcat", 58, 59, 156, 160, 161, 164, 166-168, 171, 173, 176-181, 239, 379

M

Morrison, John, 169
 Moyer, Donald C., 21-24, 28, 29, 34, 35, 42, 81, 155, 380, 381
 Mozingo, Hugh, 173, 385
 Music, department, 322, 323

Mc

McNeil, Donald R., 445-448
 McQueen, Robert, 45, 50, 137, 138

N

N. Edd Miller Day, 174, 306-310, 453
 Natatorium, UNLV, 103
 National College of the State Judiciary, 101, 110, 435
 National Education Association (NEA), 384, 385
 National Guard, Nevada, 124
 National Science Foundation, 41
 National Society for Professors (NSP), 384-386, 434, 438
 Negroes, 47, 75-81, 130, 135, 138, 143, 167, 169, 244, 250, 251, 253, 255, 257-259, 262, 266, 290, 310, 326-329, 335-339
 Nepotism, 409
Nevada, A Guide to the Silver State (WPA Writers Guide), 9
 Nevada Southern University. *See* University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Nevada State Journal, 348, 349
 Nevada State Museum, 71
 Nevada Technical Institute, 260
 Nevada Technical Institute Libraries, 95

N

News Media, 24, 40, 148,
149, 151, 176, 177, 201,
208, 213, 347-352. *See*
also KCRL; KOLO; *Nevada*
State Journal; *Reno*
Evening Gazette
Northwest Association, 222
Northeast Outreach, 77
Northern Nevada Peace Center,
127. *See also* Skorpen, Erling
Nursing. *See* Orvis School
of Nursing
Nye Hall, 370, 419

O

O'Brien, Thomas, 4, 215
O'Brien, William, 200
O'Callaghan, Donal "Mike",
360, 363, 364, 367,
424-428
Office of Student Affairs,
132, 287, 300, 302, 315,
432, 343, 390, 418
Olsen, Edward A., 66, 76,
77, 285, 309, 341, 347,
348, *See also* Information,
director
Olsen, Perry, 285
Ombudsman, 415, 416
Oral History Project, 38
Orvis, Arthur E., 104, 111
Orvis, Mrs. Arthur E., 104,
111
Orvis School of Nursing,
5, 104, 110, 111, 188,
217, 218, 223, 425, 440,
441
Orvis School of Nursing,
dean, 218
Ox-Bow Incident, 18, 19

P

Padgett, James, 248
Palmer Engineering
building, 114
Parking, 120, 121
Parsons, Ed, 110

P

Peace movement, 127, 128.
See also Committee to
Stop the War in Vietnam;
Northern Nevada Peace
Center; Skorpen, Erling;
Vietnam War
Peltier, Gary, 125, 385, 394
Personnel policy, 402
Peterson, Glen, 45-49, 131
Phi Kappa Phi, 410
Philosophy, department,
286, 416
Phoenix, Dave, 143-146,
148, 151
Physical Education and
Athletics, department,
197, 229-231, 236, 242
Physical Education building,
105, 108-110, 113, 379
Physical plant, 115
Physical Sciences building,
103
Physics building, 103, 107,
113
Pine, Edward L., 21, 41,
42, 72
Planning Board, Nevada state,
98, 105, 109-111
Police, Reno City, 137, 333,
369, 370
Police, UNR, 43, 80, 177,
331-333, 418
Policy committees, Faculty
senate, 401
Political Science, department,
261, 265
Promotion, 36, 81-83, 404,
409
Psychology, department, 17,
216, 217, 443
Public relations, 340, 341
354, 357, 359, 371. *See*
also Information, News
Service
Publications Board, 429
Pyramid Lake Room, 71

Q

Quilici, Hugo, 369
Quotas, 263, 264, 266. *See*

R

Radio and Television Board,
71
Raggio, William, 72, 148-151,
432
Ralf, Earl, 279
Reams, Peter, 130
Reams, Robert Borden,
22, 356, 357
Reams, Mrs. Robert Borden,
22
Recognition of University
groups, 122, 123, 127
Regents, Board of, 6, 24, 27,
30-34, 36, 38, 40, 43, 54,
55, 58, 62, 84, 86, 97-99,
103-105, 108, 109, 112, 113,
115, 123-125, 138, 140, 144,
148, 152-186, 189-193,
195-197, 200, 201, 203, 204,
215, 216, 225, 229, 231, 237,
238, 242, 245, 250, 254-257,
268, 269, 271, 272, 274-279,
286, 292, 299-301, 324, 325,
344, 353, 361, 365, 380-382,
390, 392, 394-399, 404-407,
409, 419, 420, 423, 438-440,
443
Registration, 81
Reid, Harry, 430
Reno City Council, 369
Reno Evening Gazette, 348-350
Research, 25, 28, 29, 36, 40
43, 56, 57
Residence hall rules and
regulations, 295, 297,
299, 300
Residence halls, 65, 161, 417
Retirement Board, Nevada
Public Employees, 379
Richardson, James, 434
Retirement plan, state, 380
Robert Wood Johnson
Foundation, 219
Ronzone, Richard, 272
Ross Business Administration
building, 112, 115
Ross, Charles, 49, 131
Ross, Silas, 112

R

ROTC, 9, 63, 64, 88, 90,
267-280, 299, 301, 304,
358, 410, 411
*Rules and Disciplinary
Procedures for Members
of the University
Community*, 392
Russell, Charles, 287,
355-357
Russell, Dave, 287

S

Sagebrush, 295, 299, 329,
352-355, 391, 429, 434
Salaries, 29, 36, 47, 53-55,
85, 86, 116, 220, 224,
383, 386, 404, 409
Sandorf, Irving, 3
Sattwhite, Jackie, 140-142
Sattwhite, Jesse, 75-77,
80, 128, 135-143, 167,
169, 179, 245, 337, 388
Sawyer, Grant, 8, 364, 379
Scattini, Jerry, 246
Scheid, Vernon E., 190
Scholarships, 141, 250,
253, 254, 255, 257
Schofield, Jack, 435
Scott, William T., 127
Scrugham Engineering and
Mines building, 111
Search warrant, University,
417, 418
Sheppard, Craig, 185, 186
Sheriff, Washoe County,
333, 369, 370
Shirley, Jack H., 119
Sinnott, Bill, 206, 365
Skorpen, Erling, 123, 127,
128, 286
Slattery, James M., 202,
206, 368, 378
Slemmons, Dave, 130, 283
Sloan, Ivy, 339
Smith, George, 198, 199,
200, 205, 208, 209, 216,
218, 219, 221, 378

S

Smith, Robert B., 431
Smotony, Bonnie, 3
Sororities, 312-314, 316,
343
Speech and Drama, department,
49
Spencer, Jack, 247, 248, 249
Springer, Charles, 138
Staff Employees Council,
414, 415
State Judiciary. *See*
National College of the
State Judiciary
Stead Facility, 369, 414
Steninger, Melvin, 59, 141,
157, 160-162, 164, 167-169,
171, 176-178, 180, 181,
429, 441
Stewart Hall, 102, 103, 121
Stout, Minard W., 14-16,
166, 175, 392
Student Bill of Rights,
289, 390-392
Student-faculty ratio, 220,
425-428
Student fees, 285, 323-325
Student government, 284,
291-295, 324, 330
Student Judicial Council,
138
Student Services, Office, 44,
101, 300, 329, 331, 344
Student Union. *See* Jot
Travis Union
Students, 8, 47, 53, 57, 63,
66, 69, 71, 76-81, 89, 116,
122, 127-132, 134, 135,
138-143, 158, 159, 161-163,
167, 168, 174, 177, 180,
187-189, 196, 212, 217,
230, 237, 240-244, 246,
247, 249, 253-256, 266,
268-271, 273, 275, 279,
281-339, 345, 346, 349,
350, 353, 354, 370, 371,
390, 391, 394, 395,
397-399, 410, 413, 417-419,
426, 432, 449, 453

S

Squires, Patrick, 38
Summer session, director, 82
Sundowners, 314, 315, 317
Swobe, Coe, 55, 433

T

Talent Search, 252
Teacher evaluation, 319
Teaching load, 86, 231
Teglia, Dan, 283, 311
Tennis, 235
Tenure, 81-83, 231, 405, 406
Thompson Education building,
112, 114
Thompson, Helen, 166, 176,
178
Thompson, Reuben C., 112
Thornton, Barbara, 173,
174, 186
Thornton Peace Prize, 411
Thornton, William C., 20
TIAA, 379
Titlow, Emerson F., 144-147,
151, 203, 368
Track, 235, 328, 329
Trachok, Richard M., 246,
247, 249, 291, 388
Tuition, 234, 255
Tupper, John, 201

U

Undergraduate Council, 85
University budget, 44, 50,
242, 318, 324, 325,
364-368, 371, 380, 381,
423-425, 427, 428, 437,
438, 442
University Code, 45, 53,
54, 84, 392-398, 400-406,
419
University Council, 14

U

University of Nevada,
 Las Vegas (UNLV), 2-5,
 15, 16, 27-29, 32, 33,
 37, 43, 89, 103, 106,
 114, 115, 149, 155, 156,
 162, 166, 195, 205, 207,
 245, 273, 362, 371, 379,
 380, 397, 400-403, 423,
 430-432, 435, 436, 440,
 441

University Press, 39

University System, 16,
 21-45, 51, 105, 111,
 141, 154, 156-158, 163,
 276, 379-381, 401-403,
 441

University System senate,
 403

Upward Bound, 252

V

Veterans of Foreign Wars,
 278

Veterans, Vietnam, 433

Vhay, David, 110, 186

Vietnam war, 277, 278,
 285, 305, 433. *See also*

Committee to Stop the
 War in Vietnam; Northern
 Nevada Peace Center; Peace
 movement; Skorpen, Erling

W

Wadsworth, Jim, 212, 213, 214

Walker, Lloyd, 334

Walsh, Dan, 209

Washoe County, 106, 152, 155,
 373, 376, 430

Washoe County Commission, 369

Washoe Medical Center,
 198-200, 203, 204

Washoe County school district,
 107

W

Water Resources Act, U. S.,
 276

Ways and Means Committee,
 Nevada state Assembly,
 427-429, 433

Wellinghoff, Jon, 241,
 290, 323

Wells, Karen, 259

Went, Frits, 198

West Coast Athletic
 Conference, 236, 237

West, John, 255, 259

White, Juanita, 3, 152,
 216, 272

Wofford, Ben, 4, 10

Wolford, E. B., 359

Wolfpack Boosters, 229,
 239, 240, 244, 388, 389

Wolves' Frolic, 315

Women, 10, 240, 241, 245,
 260-263, 265, 266, 325,
 326, 387, 433

Women's athletics, 240,

241, 245, 325, 326, 387

Women's studies, 261

Work-study, 254

Y

Young, Frank, 206

Young, Ken, 8, 10

Z

Zenoff, Dave, 435

Zorn, Roman "Jay", 156,
 166, 276

